

N O
PROTESTANT,
BUT THE
Dissenters Plot

Discovered and Defeated :
Being an A N S W E R
To the late Writings of several Eminent
DISSENTERS.

WHEREIN
Their Designs against the Established
CHURCH of *ENGLAND*, and the
Unreasonableness of SEPARATION
are more fully manifested.

By the Author of the
Second part of the History of Separation.

2 Tim. 3. 13. *Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived.*
2 Tim. 3. 9. *But they shall proceed no farther : for their folly shall be manifest to all men.*

L O N D O N :
Printed by J. C. and Freeman Collins, for Daniel Brown, at the
Black Swan and Bible without Temple-bar. 1 6 8 2.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

BOARD OF ALDERMEN

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

IN

THE


YEAR

1880

AND

T O
The Right Honourable
Edw. Seymour
ESQUIRE,

One of his Majesties Most
Honourable Privy Council.

mong the Plagues
of *Egypt*, we read,
Exod. 8. 2. that God
smote all their bor-
ders with Frogs, which came
into their Houses and Bed-
A 3 cham-

The Epistle Dedicatory.

chambers, and upon the Servants ; and the Psalmist says, into Kings Chambers too : and v. 7. there were Magicians that did the like with their Incantments. There are among us a great number of *Magi* (though I think they are no great Conjurers) who have filled the Land with such noisome Creatures, I mean such factious and seditious Pamphlets, as are croaking almost in every House and Chamber, not excepting that of the

The Epistle Dedicatory.

the Kings most Honourable Privy Council. One of them lately fastned on the Hand of the *Right Honourable the Earl of Hallifax*, though I doubt not but with great indignation he shook it off, as *St. Paul* did the Viper that leapt on his hand, which fell into the fire to its own destruction, without any hurt to that great Person: yet the Reputation of that great Name which is prefixed, and the Charms wherewith the Triple-Author recommends it to the

The Epistle Dedicatory.

unwary People, as if it were
the Onely way of Concord which will
effectually unite us not onely in a way
the least novel, and most consistent
with the Civil Establishment, p. 1.
of the Preface, may make
those spotted Creatures not
onely to be taken into the
hands, but the bosoms of too
many, who (as Experience
teacheth us) have been al-
ready stung with them as by
so many Serpents.

The Pamphlet is intituled
A Reply to the Defence of Dr. Stil-
ling-

The Epistle Dedicatory.

lingfleet; under whose name, neither the Defendor nor the Doctor, but the Established Church is directly struck at; but with so little appearance of Truth or Reason, and such apparent Malice, that all the Evidences which they produce to speak against the Church, flie in their own faces, and bear witness as much to the Reputation of the Church, as to the confusion of such implacable Enemies

When

The Epistle Dedicatory.

When *Mahomet* pretending to the People that he would do a great Miracle, perceived that after all his Outcries the Mountain would not come to him, he was not ashamed to go to the Mountain: but these men being so bound up by the shame and fear of the People, that they dare not move towards the Mountain, are still so confident as to perswade the People that the Mountain will yet come to them, and the

Efta-

The Epistle Dedicatory.

Established Church may be easily reduced to their inconsistent Model.

I shall not endeavour to prepossess your Honour with the tendency of this Designe, nor the undue Arts whereby they seek to effect it; I had rather it should be read in their own Language than mine: I shall onely remove those thin pretences whereby they seek to obtrude it on credulous persons, by a few Animadversions;

The Epistle Dedicatory.

sions ; which if they may be thought worthy of your Honours approbation, I most humbly intreat that they may be communicated to that Noble Earl, whose better Employments may not permit him to search out those secret but mischievous Intrigues which are by such Pamphlets insinuated to the minds of unwary People. And herein your great Integrity and successful Activity for the Established Government in Church and State,

The Epistle Dedicatory

State, have encouraged me to hope for your Honours Patronage; which I no otherwise expect, than the merit of the Cause which I defend, and the honest Methods used for its Vindication, may deserve.

Moreover, I hold my self obliged in Gratitude to make a publick acknowledgement of the manifold Benefits which this Populous City and the County adjacent, do now enjoy by your
Ho-

The Epistle Dedicatory.

Honours gracious condescension to favour us with a Visit upon our importunity in a time of need. Those two great Bodies were become paralytick by the loss of a Chief Minister of Justice (Sir Thomas Carew) with whom a great part of our Loyal Bloud and Spirits seemed to be exhausted, and many Members disjoynted; but by your powerful influence there was a new Fermentation, and our Loyal Bloud and Spirits began to

cir-

The Epistle Dedicatory.

circulate, and every Joyant
received new Vigour and A-
ctivity, and the whole Body
is reduced to an Athletick
habit: from whence it was
that so many thousands were
animated to that Loyal Ad-
dress to his Sacred Majesty,
which is not to be parallel'd
in any other County of the
Nation, for Number or
Quality. The hands of our
Magistracy are strengthned,
the Factions are weakned,
the Commonalty, and espe-
cially the Clergy, are encou-
raged

The Epistle Dedicatory.

rag'd in their several Du-
ties ; among whom none
hath a more grateful Resent-
ment of such publick Bene-
fits, than

Exon. Feb. 24.

Your Honours

1681.

most humble Servant,

Thos. Long

No

No Protestant,

BUT

The DISSENTERS PLOT.

Of the Title of their Book.



He Authors name their Pamphlet, *A Reply, &c.* though they no otherwise reply to *the Defence of Dr. Stillingsfleet*, than the Armies raised by their Predecessours, did to the Kings Armies; by whom being sometimes soundly beaten, they ran away: and to support the hearts of their People, boasted of a Victory, and presumed to mock God with a day of Thanksgiving.

The Authors having named their Pamphlet, *A Reply to the Defence of Dr. Stillingsfleet*, as if they were conscious to themselves that it would not bear that Title, they adde, *Being a Counter-Plot for Union between the Protestants, in opposition to the Project of others for Conjunction with the*
B Church

*Church of Rome. A Plot then there is, by the Confession of these men, but it is disguised with the Masque of a Counter-plot for Union between the Protestants. Now if we consider who these Protestants are, that are to be united, it will appear, that those of the Church established cannot be of the number: for that Establishment must be destroyed. And this Plot is in Opposition to the Project of others for Conjunction with the Church of Rome. Who are those others? Dr. Stillingfleet and his Defender, in opposition to whom the Reply is written. For as it hath been the fate of the Church in general to be accused of making many steps towards Rome; so the Reverend Doctor is slandered by these men, as one that hath favoured their Designs; though neither any Church, nor any Person now in being, stands at more open defiance with that Church. But these Dissenters wanting Arguments to confute their Adversaries, have most confidence in this popular way of reproaching them as Papists. Now if it be (as it is most) certain, that the Doctor doth as strenuously oppose the Church of Rome, as he doth defend the Church of England; it is obvious to all indifferent persons, that while the Dissenters do pretend that they oppose the Project of the Doctor and others, for Conjunction with the Church of Rome, they do in truth oppose the established Church of England. And whoever most successfully defends that, *Altar*, is thought most fit to be made a *Sacrifice* to their Ambition and Malice.*

This

the DISSENTERS Plot. 3

This Plot is carried on by the Authors 1. *Of the modest and peaceable Enquiry*, (i. e.) Stephen Lob. 2. *Of the Reflections*, (i. e.) *the Country Conformist* (or John an Oakes.) 3. *Of the peaceable Designe*, (i. e.) Mr. Humphries: A Triumvirate that are risen up to supply the Defects and Failings of their falling Dictator, from whom they have been instructed to rail and threaten in Scripture-Language, in the words of *Abner* to *Joab*, *Shall the Sword devour for ever?* As if they had suffered all those Extremities which the Sword could inflict. And do they not seem to threaten by way of Revenge, that it will be *bitterness in the latter end?* And we cannot be ignorant what havock they would make, if they had a *bead fit* for their *hands*, which they say, are ready for the Work. The Preface is dedicated

To the Right Hon^{able} the Earl of Hallifax.

It had been Presumption enough, if these men had published such a pernicious Pamphlet without Name or Dedication: but to entitle so great and judicious a Person to it, *One that is at the Helm in the administration of the greatest Affairs*, (as they observe;) to which I may adde, One that is of his Majesties most Honourable Privy Council; an eminent Member of that Church which they seek to destroy; one whom Dr. Burnet, in the Preface to the second Part of the *History of Reformation*, reckoneth among the greatest persons that

4 No PROTESTANT, but

this Age hath produced. I am sure (says the Doctor) all that know him, will allow that I speak modestly of him. Now to think of prostituting so great Honour so well deserved, and lay it in the dust with themselves; to interests such a person in such a vile designe, is an unpardonable insolence. They could not conceive, but that a person of that Honour and Integrity would abhor the motion of destroying the Established Church; and that he wanted not judgment to perceive, that this is the *Dissenters* Designe, to perswade him to be an Agent in pulling down that Church which (as *Jerusalem* once was) is *the Glory of the whole Earth*; and to erect a *Babel*, which would render us a *Reproach and Hissing to all Nations*; when such an act would certainly bury him, as *Sampson* was, under the Ruines of that Fabrick.

The Heathen sharply reprov'd such Votaries as invocated their Deities to prosper and protect them in their Frauds and Robberies.

*Pulchra Laverna,
Da mihi fallere, da justum sanctumq; videri;
Noctem peccatis, & fraudibus objice nubem.*

*Fairest Laverna, grant
That I may rob and cheat, and yet appear a Saint.*

For this was to represent their Gods to be such as themselves. The like is the affront offered to this noble Earl: for the plain English of the Dedication,

the DISSENTERS Plot. 5

dication, is this; Right Honourable, we desire that your Noble Robes may be made a Cloak to hide our Ignoble Enterprizes: we have many hands ready to pull down the established Church; you will find a *Foundation laid, and Materials made ready for another Model*; there is wanting *onely the perfecting skill of some Master-builder, and then hands to work*: And that the Earl might know they meant him, they tell him, the thing designed is *so momentous, that it concerns Statesmen, such as his Lordship is*. They tell this Noble Earl, that *he cannot fiddle*; yet they would have him *dance after their Pipe*; who Nero-like, have put the whole Nation into a Combustion, and please themselves with a dexterity in *running division* as their sweetest Musick. They tell him also, that as *Themistocles he can govern a State*; but not a word of *Themistocles* his being banished by an Ostracism of those malevolent Athenians, after all his study and labour to establish them in Prosperity and Peace. They desire his Lordship to look over *onely the Preface and the last half-sheet of the book*: And I humbly beseech his Lordship to read over the following *Animadversions* on them. As for the *Reply* it self, it is the Province of a more able person, who I doubt not will chastize them more severely than I have done: but their own Consciences may do it above any other. They confess that they are *conscious that the blame that they deserve upon the account of their Dedication, is too much for one of them to bear*; and

6 No PROTESTANT, but

indeed too much for two or three such Leading-men to incur: And whether they succeed, or are defeated, I onely pray that they may see their folly, and repent before it be too late.

The Occasion of the Work.

SIR,

YOU have obliged me by the information you give (though it be no news to) me, how much reproach is cast on my back by some Dissenters; which I verily believe, because much, hath been thrown in my face by the same hands: but I know no reason why they are become my Enemies, except it be for telling them the truth, (i. e.) for charging some Leading-men among them with Hypocrisie, in pretending for Peace, and acting the contrary. And my fault (you say) is greatly aggravated, from the Learning and Piety of their persons: and I am reduced to this Dilemma; I must as publickly ask them pardon, as I have offended them; or else I must make good proof of the Charge. I confess I wrote so much concerning Mr. B. in a Tract called The Nonconformists Plea impleaded; and I thought the proof there given had been undeniable: yet being constrained by their importunate Clamours, I have added what may amount to a Demonstration. He that shall read the Preface of The Vindication
of

of the Primitive Church, in answer to Mr. B's Church-History, will see what cause there is to admire his Learning and Sincerity, as an Historian; and for his Pietie as a Divine, that appears in the second part of the History of Separation: So that I shall say little of him here; but that he hath lived to accomplish the Predictions of some Prophets of his own partie, related by Mr. Bagshaw, p. 152. who says, That one worthy of credit told him that the learned and judicious Mr. Herle said, It had been happy for the Church of God, if Mr. B's Friends had never sent him to School; and that Mr. Cawdry had the same opinion: And that another person, as knowing in the Mystery of Godliness as either of them, told a Friend of his, That notwithstanding the noise about him, Mr. B. would end in Flesh and Bloud. At least he should dread his own Prophetick fears of being a Fire-brand in Hell, for being a Fire-brand in the Church.

The Scriptures make Peaceableness a chief Mark of a holy man: Holiness which is against Love, is a Contradiction; Mr. B's Preface to Church Divisions. But this holy man hath had his hand against men of all degrees, Kings, Bishops, Nobles, and Lay-Elders; of all Perswasions, (yea, even of his own) and hath felt theirs against him: Not onely Anabaptists and Quakers, but against the Assembly, against Dr. Owen, and Firmine, Bagshaw, Kendal, Tombes, and Goodwin; against Dr. Tully, Mr. Cartwright of York, and Dr. Hinkly; against Bishop Morley, Dr. Hammond,

8 No PROTESTANT, but

and Dr. Pierce. And as if all, both Conformists and Nonconformists of the present Age, were too few for him to encounter, he raiseth the Shades of all the Primitive Fathers and Governours of the Church; and fights against them, to the wounding of Christianity it self. And as if all this were too little, he hath contradicted himself, in almost as many things as he hath all the rest. This is that incomparable man, to whom neither Dr. Stillingfleet nor Bishop Jewel may be parallel'd; whose Judgment and Authority is preferred above that of the Primitive Fathers and Councils; and all his Profelytes are ready Jurare in verba Magistri, and think it reasonable that he should prescribe new Laws for the Reformation not onely of the Church of England, but of the Christian World. But enough hath been said of him, even out of his own mouth.

My present task is to shew that the Disciples are not much beneath their Master, in the Arts of lying, slandering, and magnifying one another: which I have chosen to do, from the Preface and Half-sheet annexed to a late Book called A Reply to the Defence of Dr. Stillingfleet, composed by the joynt labour of Mr. Lobb, Mr. Humphries, and the Country-Conformist: From which it will appear to any but an Ignoramus, or bigotted Zealot, by their falsifying the Testimonies of our first Reformers; their wresting and misapplying of Scripture; their requiring such terms of Concord as were never yet heard of in the Christian World; their endeavours to subvert the established Church, and on her Ruines to raise

the DISSENTERS Plot. 9

raise a Babel for Independent and Anabaptistical Congregations; their opposing the Office of Bishops in the hand of others, that they may take their power and authority to themselves; by these, and other such black Arts brought to the light in the following Animadversions, I doubt not but it will appear to every impartial Reader, that there is not onely secret Hypocrisie, but open Malice in their designs against the Church of England as by Law established; and that these Dissenters will stand self-condemned, and both you and all impartial Readers will acquit

Your humble Servant,

T. L.

Of their Preface.

THE first care of the Prefacer, is to set a good face on a bad matter: *The hearts* (he says) *of the most men at this present juncture (or at least their faces) are set upon Union of the Protestants.* Union is a thing so amiable, that every Faction, *Popish, Presbyterian, and Independent,* yea, the very *Quakers* pretend a Zeal for it: but every one would have all the rest to unite on their own terms. Of this, King *Charles* speaks excellently
in

10 No PROTESTANT, but

in his Chapter of Reformation: *The specious and popular Titles of Christs Government, Throne, Scepter, and Kingdom, (which certainly is not divided, nor hath two faces, as their parties now have at least), also the noise of a thorough Reformation, may as easily be fixed on new Models, as fair Colours to ill-favoured Figures.* But the Union here designed, is the *Union of Protestants*; which word (as now used) is of a very uncertain signification: for, p. 15. speaking of Union among sound Protestants, he reckoneth not onely *Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Congregational*, but *meer Anabaptists*. Of these he tells us, p. 18. *It were easie to make it appear, that the differences among the Dissenters in general (which are a greater number than those before named) about Worship and Discipline, are rather nominal than real; and that their Union is in a manner already accomplished.* From this Union certainly the *Episcopal Party* is excluded; yea, it is plain this Union is patcht up in opposition to them, under the odious representation of being *Projectors for a Conjunction with the Church of Rome*: And the whole designe of this Counter-plot is to destroy the established Government by Bishops, and to establish a *firm and lasting Union among the Dissenters in general*; all sound Protestants, not *Anabaptists* onely, but *Quakers* and *Fifthmonarchy men*. Nor can I wonder at this Union, when one of these *Dissenters*, in the name of his Brethren, pleaded that the Papists too might partake of such a Union in the late Toleration:

the DISSENTERS Plot. 11

ration: for thus says *The peaceable Designer*, in the first Edition of his Book, printed 1675. *The Papist, in our account, is but one sort of Recusants, (or Dissenters) and the conscientious and peaceable among them must be held in the same predicament with those among our selves, that likewise refuse to come to Common prayer. --- But as for the common Papist, who lives innocently in his way, he is to us as other Separatists, and so comes under the like Toleration.* By which we see, that the help of any Party, *Anabaptists* or *Papists*, are acceptable to the *Dissenters*, when there is any probability of afflicting or destroying the established Church.

But let us see what means are chosen to establish this firm and lasting Union. They say, *Among the Conformists some seem to propose the execution of the Penal Laws.* This fatal blow is aimed at the Reverend Dean: for, p. 39. they say, *The Doctor judgeth a severe execution of the Laws against Dissenters, to be the most effectual means to obtain a firm and lasting Union.* But from such, the *Dissenters* differ in opinion. Yet time was when the Penal Laws were thought too mild a punishment to be inflicted on the *Episcopal Party*, while the *Dissenters* were in power: though they wanted the Authority, and as they call it, *The Sword of the Laws*, they made use of *the Law of the Sword* against all such as would not conform to them. Not unlike to the *Donatists* in St. *Austin's* time, who complain'd of Persecution, when they were the Aggressors: *Nos ab armatis vestris fustibus*

12 No PROTESTANT, but

fustibus & ferro concidimur, & vos dicitis pati persecutionem. In the days of *Julian*, the Donatists had Indulgence and Countenance; and then they used his, as well as their own power, to afflict the Orthodox: *Urgentibus & presentibus Episcopis vestris persecutionem disponebat*, as *Optatus*, p. 57. While *Constantine* was in the Throne, none petitioned and pleaded for a Toleration more than the Donatists; but when *Julian* was Emperour, and restored their Churches to them, that Apostate and profest Enemy of Christianity was not so sanguinary as they. *St. Augustine* was once of the same opinion, that the Donatists were not to be forced by the Imperial Laws; and he always petitioned that they might not extend to death: But when he perceived what great multitudes they led on, to the destruction of their Bodies, as well as of their Souls, he was of another Judgment; and argued strongly for the execution of such Laws as might restrain their Violence and Impiety. *Clamate si audetis puniantur Homicidia, puniantur Adulteria, sola Sacrilegia volumus à regnantium legibus impunita?* How can you say, that Murther and Adultery ought to be punished by the Magistrate, but sacrilegious Schisms ought to be permitted? Or that it is not the duty of the Magistrate to contradict or punish you when ye are injurious to his Church and Worship? If a pretence of Conscience may supersede the execution of the Law, few Offenders would be punished for any Transgression. *St. Aug.* wrote an Epistle

pistle to *Bonifacius* an Officer of the Emperours, which in his *Retractions*, lib. 2. he calls *Librum de correctione Donatistarum*; wherein he asserts the power of the Magistrate to make coercive Laws in the case of Religion. 1. Because the Kings that did it not under the Law, were blamed; and such as did it, are commended. 2. Because it is their duty as Kings: *Aliter enim servit Deo qua Homo, aliter qua Rex*: As a Man, by living faithfully; as a King, by executing with convenient rigour such Laws as command things that are just, and forbid what is

contrary: for what man can say to Kings, *Nolite curare in regno vestro à quo teneatur vel oppugnetur Ecclesia Domini nostri*? As if they ought not to regard the Piety

The King (as the sixth Oecumenical Council said of Constantine) is to be, Τὸς μὲν Οὐδοδεῖας ὑπὸ μαχῶν τῆς ἀρχαίας ἀρχῆς ἀρτῆμαχῶν.

of men, as well as the Chastity of women; or it concerned them that there should be no Bastards, and not that there should be no Idolaters or sacrilegious persons in their Kingdoms. 3. Because Kings may redress what others cannot, they having the Sword given them to that end. And whereas the *Donatists* objected, *Cui vim Christus intulit*? He answers, Our Lord first invited Guests, and upon refusal compelled them to his great Supper: Wherefore if those that are found by the *Highways and Hedges* (i. e.) among *Hereticks* or *Schismaticks*, be constrained to the Lords Vineyard, let them not find fault that they are driven by force, but consider whither they are driven,

14 No PROTESTANT, but

driven, even to those Pastures where they may find true food and rest to their Souls. 4. Because the *Donatists* used unjust violence to suppress the Catholicks, Christian Princes might much more use their just power to support them: *Cur non cogeret Ecclesia perditos filios ut redirent, si perditifilii coegerent alios ut perirent?* Epist. 50. And *Contra Parmen.* lib. 1. *An justior est privata violentia quam Regia diligentia?* *An perperam agitur cum Reges prohibent divisionem, & non cum Episcopi dividunt unitatem?* Is it not fit for Kings to make up Divisions? And is it fit for your Bishops to divide Unity? But as the Royal Martyr observed, *No men are prone to be greater Tyrants, and more rigorous exactors upon others to conform to their illegal Novelties, than such whose pride was formerly least disposed to the obedience of lawful Constitutions.* We need not go as far as Geneva to confirm this Observation, where *Castellio* is expelled for being of a contrary Judgment to *Calvin*; one is put to death for libelling him, and the whole City divided by his Quarrel with *Petrinus*, so as they were ready to cut Throats: *Servetus* also was by these men burnt for Heresie, some others hardly escaping. But I have mentioned these, because the Rigours and Cruelties used here at home, are too fresh in memory to be forgotten. Hear his Majesties complaint of a greater Rigour and Barbarity than is ever used by Christians to the meanest Prisoners and greatest Malefactors; whom, though the Justice of the Law

deprives of worldly comforts, yet the Mercy of Religion allows them the Benefit of the Clergie, as not aiming at once to destroy their Bodies and damn their Souls. EIK. BAZIL. p. 207.

Now what person is there who hath lived to see his Fathers house rifled and spoiled by Thieves and Robbers, some of which bound the old man, and others (not thinking themselves secure) barbarously murdered him, and many of his chief Servants, and hardly permitting his innocent Children to escape with their lives: What person, I say, having seen all this, and being by a High hand brought back again to the Inheritance of his Fathers, can be blamed by any but Thieves and Robbers, if he do diligently repair those Breaches which those mischievous persons made, and stop up those Avenues by which they entred, and keep constant Watch and Ward, especially when he knows that a number of them who are his covenanted Enemies have frequent Meetings in the Neighbourhood, and lie in Ambushes, waiting for opportunities, and making approaches by the same degrees and methods as their Predecessours had done, to act over the same Tragical Scene, the remembrance whereof yet filleth him with Horrour? This is the Case of the King and Kingdom: They have made good and wholesome Laws to dissolve the Combinations, to prevent the private Meetings and Associations of ill-affected persons, to discover and defeat the designs, and perhaps to punish the Contrivers of their se-

cond

16 No PROTESTANT, but

cond Ruine; and who but a *Conspirator* can call this *Tyranny* and *Persecution*, and revile those faithful Servants who keep Watch and Ward to defend their own and their Sovereigns lives against such as declare themselves their irreconcilable Enemies? Yet this is not the full Case of our *Dissenters*: They have had an Act of Free Grace, *General Pardon and Oblivion*; they are admitted to the same Priviledges, and made capable of the same Preferments as any of his Majesties Subjects: They live under as good Laws, as easie a Government, and gracious Indulgences, as any Nation under Heaven; yet are they alway murmuring and complaining, railing and threatening, combining and *associating* themselves in several Parties, as if they would once more *kill and slay, and seize the Inheritance*. I would know of any disinterested person, under what Government in the world those men would acquiesce, and live in obedience, that are so troublesome under our own; or what Prince would with so much Lenity endure such Affronts as his Majesty hath done. I know, that as they pretend that they are the Assertors of the ancient Government of the *true Protestant Church of England*: so they pretend with equal truth, to be the onely Loyal Subjects that his Majesty hath. They plead not for themselves onely, *That no people under Heaven have more Loyal Principles than they*; but for their Predecessors, who made the like Protestations when they were actually engaged in a Bloudy War against their

Sove,

the DISSENTERS Plot. 17

Sovereign, and rejected all his Messages for Peace. Yet they have started another Paradox, (viz.) *That they were the Conformists that began our late Wars between themselves.* I wish the *Dissenters* would leave blowing the Trumpets, and gathering their Party in Consults and Conventicles, and then we should not fear a War from the *Conformists*.

But do the *Dissenters* indeed differ in Opinion from such as are for the Penal Laws? Both Mr. *Baxter* and Dr. *Owen* were sometime of Opinion, that Penal Laws ought to be made and inflicted for matters of Religion. Thus Mr. *Baxter*: *You must either tolerate all men to do what they will make a matter of Conscience or Religion, and then some may offer their Children in Sacrifice to the Devil, and some may think they do God service in killing his Servants; or else you must tolerate no error or fault in Religion, and then you must advise what measure of penalties you will inflict,* p. 363. of *Church-divisions*. Dr. *Owen* is more large, in a *Sermon to the Parliament*, Oct. 13. 1652. when the Factions opposed *Cromwel's* Government. He tells them of the *Trust* reposed by God in the *Rulers, Judges, Kings, and Magistrates* of the Church under the *Old Testament*, in reference to the *Ways and Worship of God*; the prosecution and execution of the *Laws of God* concerning his *House and Service* being committed to them. --- And their neglect in the discharge of their duty was then commonly attended with the *Apostacy* of the whole Church, and

C

great

18 No PROTESTANT, but

great breakings forth of the indignation of the Lord... The Lord hath promised that the Magistrates whom he will give, own, and bless, shall put forth their power, and act in that capacity wherein he hath placed you in the world for the good furtherance and prosperity of the Truth and Church of Christ; they shall protect them with their Power, feed them with their Substance, adorn them with their Favour and the Priviledges wherewith they are intrusted; they shall break their forcibly oppressing Adversaries.... And speaking of the Gospel, he says, It will interest any people in all the Promises that are made for the using of the Church to thresh, break, destroy, burn, fire, consume, and slay the Enemies thereof.... And it is the duty of the Magistrate to prevent, obviate, remove, take away every thing that will bring Confusion, Destruction, and Desolation on the people.... In general Seditions, Tumults, Disorders, in particular, violent, or fraudulent breakings in upon the respective bounds, priviledges, enjoyments of singular persons. With much more to the same purpose: But now, as Plowden observed, the Case is altered. P. 54. Dr. Owen determined, That in things of Practice, and so of Perswasion, that are impious in themselves, or in their Consequents, the Plea of Conscience is an aggravation of the Crime: if mens Consciences are seared, and they are given up to a reprobate mind, to do those things that are not convenient; there is no doubt they ought to suffer such punishment as to such practices are assigned and appointed.

Others

Others (he says) *insist on a Submission to the Bishops of the Universal Church.* This he imputes to the Author of *Dean Stillingfleet's Defence*: Which how far he hath asserted, I shall not now enquire; he is of ability to answer for himself. But if the Determinations of an inferior Classis of Presbyters, whose authority is cryed up to be of Divine Institution, be held authentick; I see not but the Decisions of a *General Council*, if it might be had, would be much more obligatory. What sound Protestant is there (except some of your Anabaptists, that would destroy both Magistrate and Minister) that hath not a great Reverence for the four first General Councils? And if our National Church be independent on Forreign Churches, I see not but the Rules and Canons prescribed by a Convocation of our Clergy, ought to be submitted to by all sound Protestants. The late *Conformist*, who pleads the Cause of the *Nonconformists*, in his second Plea, p. 10. acknowledgeth, *That the antient Nonconformists asserted a Government and Discipline of Divine Right by Presbyterian Classes, Synods, and Lay-Elders, and esteemed every Presbytery as a Tribunal of Christ.* And if they ascribed so much to every inferior Classis, a National or more general Council cannot be denied a just Authority.

But that I may come to the grand Designe of the *Dissenters*: The *Prefacer* begins very modestly: *I will not presume (says he) on any thing proposed*

20 No PROTESTANT, but

posed by us. Yet presently, as if he had found Mr. B.'s *Onely Way of Concord*, he shews us *what will most effectually conduce to unite us in a way the least novel, and most consistent to the Civil Establishment*: These are two good Strings to his Bow; but there is a third better than both these, to wit, *The antient Constitution of our Government in Ecclesiastical Affairs*. If this String will agree with their Bow, they have found out such a *threefold Cord* as Solomon speaks of, that is not easily broken.

But as the *Dissenters* handle this Cord, it will appear to be as useless to their Designe, as a Rope of Sand. I begin, as they do, first to consider how agreeable their Designe is to the ancient Constitution of our Government about matters Ecclesiastical, which (as they say) is very excellently described in (the Book called) *The necessary Doctrine and Erudition of a Christian-man, composed by several Bishops and other great Doctors, and approved by Authority in the days of King Henry the Eighth*. The *Dissenters* cannot have a greater Reverence for that Book than the *Conformists* have, as to the Constitution of our Church. And to corroborate this Authority, they adde that of another excellent Book (*viz.*) *Dr. Burnet's History of the Reformation*; for which, as they observe, *the whole Kingdom have given the Doctor thanks*: And I shall think the worse of these *Dissenters*, if they will not do the same. P. 16. From these Books they attempt to prove, that

that *the establishing a Parochial or Congregational Church-Discipline* (the great thing which the *Dissenters* desire) *may be done consistently with the ancient Constitution of the Government of this Realm, to the fixing the desired, firm, and lasting Union.* P. 11. If this appear, the *Dissenters* may well boast that they are the Genuine Sons of the Church of *England*, as it was settled by the first Reformers; and that they have been (as they complain) *misrepresented as Enemies both to Church and State; as if the adhering to old Protestant Principles about Church-Discipline had been the Overt Act of a Spirit seditious and phanatical,* p. 17. To these two they have appealed for the truth of their Assertion; and I hope they will not shew themselves such double-minded men, as to be *unstable in all their ways*, and not stand to the Evidence and Arbitration of these two Authorities produced by themselves. And if the reducing of us to the ancient Constitution of Church-government and Discipline in this Realm, may fix the desired, firm, and lasting Union, it will be still the *Dissenters* fault that we are not all agreed.

In that Judicious Tract 'tis manifest (say the *Dissenters*, p. 2.)

1. *That Church-government is Jure Divino.* Be it so.

2. *That to the constituting such a Church-government, those Church Officers onely are necessary who are mentioned in the New Testament.* This is also granted.

22 No PROTESTANT, but

3. That in the New Testament there is mention made of no other Church Officers but Priests and Deacons. This is *sub judice*.

4. That Bishops or Priests, the sole Governours of the Church, are of one and the same Order. This also is to be determined.

To all this I shall oppose a short Syllogism, viz.

That Church government which is mentioned in the New Testament (by the Compilers of the *Necessary Erudition*) is *Jure Divino*.

But the Church-government mentioned, &c. is by Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.

Ergo, the Church government by Bishops, Priests, and Deacons is *Jure Divino*, according to the *Necessary Erudition*.

It chanced that on reading this Preface, I had at hand that ancient Book, printed in English 1543. and set forth by the Kings Authority, as appears by the Preface. I had also a Translation of the same Book into elegant Latine, printed the following year, viz. 1544. This Latine Book hath a Preface more than I find in the English, which seems to be compiled by the Archbishop and the rest of the reforming Clergy, who give us this reason of the translating it into Latine: *Quam Institutionem (Lector Carissime) Illustrissimi simul & Religiosissimi Principis industria primum vernaculo sermone editam, nos nunc in Latinum versam in lucem damus; Quod indignum duximus ut hoc pacificandæ*

candæ Ecclesiæ studium, & exemplum quo Regia Majestas immortalem sibi gloriam promerita est in obscuro lateret, ac non potius orbi universo, quo cæteri Principes ad similem componendæ Religionis zelum excitentur innotesceret: (i. e.) Which Eru-
dition first published in English by the industry of our most illustrious and religious Prince, we now publish in Latine; as thinking it an unworthy thing, that the care and good example of pacifying the Church, whereby his Majesty hath deserved immortal glory, should lie hid, and not be known to the world, to stir up other Princes to the like Zeal.

From whence I desire the Reader to observe, that this Book being set forth a year after the English one, and being somewhat explained and enlarged, as intended to inform the Forreign Churches with the matter and order of our Reformation, is of the two the more exact and perfect, as containing their second thoughts and final resolutions. The place quoted out of that Book, is that which concerns *The Sacrament of Orders; which (say they) are given of God to Christian men by the Consecration and Imposition of the Bishops hands.* And doubtless King Henry would have been very much in wrath with any that should have denied the Order of Bishops to be Sacramental, when by their hands, and by a *power given them of God*, as is there asserted, other Orders were to be conveyed.

But secondly, I observe, that whereas that Book

24 No PROTESTANT, but

nameth Bishops And Priests as two distinct Orders, these *Dissenters*, by a little trick (learnt of the Jesuits) of changing a small syllable, would alter the sence of the whole Chapter: for four or five times in the second and third pages, the *Dissenters* name *Bishops Or Priests*, making them one and the same thing; which the Reformers in that Chapter of Orders do distinguish as two distinct Orders; and eight times at least read *Bishops And (not Or) Priests* in sensu diviso. In the first place it is said, that *St. Paul did consecrate and order Priests and Bishops*; for which they quote 1 Tim. 4. (i.e.) Jure Divino. And again, as the *Apostles themselves did order Priests and Bishops*, so they appointed and willed other *Bishops after them to do the like*; for which they quote Titus 1. and 1 Tim. 5. which is another proof out of the New Testament. In another place they say, that *the Priests and Bishops in the execution of their Office and Ministration, do use and exercise the power and authority of God committed unto them*. And to name but one place more (for I shall quote those onely which in the sence of those Reformers (and our Dissenters too) prove the Order of Bishops to be distinct from that of Priests, and of Divine Institution) speaking of the power of the Prince over Bishops and Priests, they say, that *the Prince is to oversee and cause the said Bishops and Priests to execute their Pastoral Office truly and faithfully, and specially in those points which by Christ and his Apostles were*
given

given and committed to them. So that it is undeniable that Bishops are mentioned as Church-Officers in the New Testament by this excellent Book, and consequently are necessary to such a Church-government as is *Jure Divino* according to the first and second Assertion of the Dissenters.

Let us inquire therefore how they derive their third Assertion from this Book ; which is, That *in the new Testament there is mention made of no other Church-Officers but Priests and Deacons.* (To which words they immediately adde) That *no other Government is of Divine Right, but what is under the conduct of Bishops or Priests,* and that *the New Testament mentioneth no other* : Which grants that *Bishops* are mentioned in the New Testament as well as *Priests*. But the *Dissenters* will not grant them to be mentioned in the sense of the Reformers (that is) as a distinct Office, and having a Superiority over Priests and Deacons : for in the

Fourth Assertion they say, *That Bishops or Priests, the sole Governours of the Church, are of one and the same Order.* For proof whereof, they quote these words out of the *Necessary Erudition*, (viz.) *That Bishops, or Priests and Deacons, are the onely Orders mentioned in the New Testament----* And that of these two Orders onely, (i.e.) *Priests and Deacons*, *Scripture maketh express mention.* To which I answer, That it is no-where said in the *Necessary Erudition*, That *Bishops or Priests,*

26 No PROTESTANT, but

Priests, the sole Governours of the Church, are of one and the same Order: And that this Assertion is contradicted by the following Quotation upon which they ground it, (*viz.*) *That Bishops, or Priests and Deacons are the onely Orders mentioned in the New Testament.* For throughout that whole Chapter, the Reformers make as plain a distinction between *Bishops* and *Priests*, as between *Priests* and *Deacons*.

I do therefore reject the first Assertion as a Fiction of their own, not to be found in the *Necessary Erudition*, nor in the practice of the Authors of it, which could best expound their meaning, *viz. That Bishops or Priests are of one and the same Order.*

As to the second, *viz. That of these two Orders onely (i. e.) of Priests and Deacons, the Scripture maketh mention;* I hope to give such a plain and genuine sense of the Authors, as our *Dissenters* (notwithstanding all their Prejudices and Evasions) shall not be able to deny. And (because, *Qui benè distinguit, benè docet*) I desire them to observe this distinction of the word *Order*, which signifieth either the Power and Faculty conferred by the Apostles hands; or the *Modus*, the Rite and Ceremony of imposition of Hands and Prayer, by which it was conferred. The first is properly *Order*, and the second, as they term it, *Ordering* or *Ordination*. Now I will not dispute in which sense our Reformers use the word *Order* in this place; the Context will shew that. But let

let the *Dissenters* take it in which sence they will, it will be so far from establishing, that it will overthrow their Propositions, *That Bishops and Priests are one and the same Order ; and that of these two onely SS maketh expresse mention.*

I grant therefore, that this second sentence is found intire in that Book, (viz.) *Of these two Orders onely, (i. e.) Priests and Deacons, Scripture maketh expresse mention.* But had these men been so ingenuous as to quote the whole Paragraph, or to judge of the sence of this Expression, which is somewhat dark, by those which were more plain, whereof some go before, and others follow that sentence, and all declare Bishops to be a distinct Order, and to be mentioned in the N. Testament ; they would never have had the confidence so to expose these learned Reformers, as if they had contradicted themselves in the same breath, and professed their Judgment to be contrary to their Practice, in a Book of that importance, written with great advice and deliberation, and published to give the world an account of the Reformation. Could their Popish Adversaries of that Age have fixed such an Opinion and Contradiction on them, they should have heard of it as loudly as we have of the *Nags-head fable* : but they had not the confidence to feign them guilty of that Opinion which these *Dissenters* would force on them whether they will or no. For the Papists of that Age knew that *Lex currit cum praxi*, and that the Reformers exercising Episcop

pal

28 No PROTESTANT, but

pal Authority over the Presbyters within their severall Diocesses, was a clear proof that they judged their Order to be superiour to that of Priests, and that by Divine Institution (as in the four places above-mentioned doth appear.)

But to clear this Objection, I shall first examine the place quoted as it is entire. Secondly, I shall shew the sense of it from the Latine Translation, which is the best Commentary. And thirdly, from the received opinion of other Divines of that Age. And fourthly, I shall give you Dr. Burnet's opinion of the whole matter.

First, The place quoted says thus: *Of these two Orders onely (i. e.) Priests and Deacons, Scripture maketh expresse mention, and how they were conferred of the Apostles by Prayer and Imposition of their hands: and to these two the Primitive Church did adde and conjoyn certain other inferiour and lower degrees, as Subdeacons, Acolytes, Exorcists, with divers other, of the which mention is made both of the most ancient Writers that we have in the Church of Christ after the Apostles; as also in divers old Councils, and namely in the fourth Council of Africk, in which St. Augustine was present; where all the kinds of Orders which were then in the Church be rehearsed.* Now though what hath been observed from the Context, might be enough to satisfie all persons that were not maliciously disposed to quarrel with those Reformers as if they contradicted themselves, and overthrew that Episcopal Order in *Thesi*, which they

they maintained *in Praxi*; yet this Paragraph is so clear by its own light, that they must needs wink with both eyes that could not see the sense of the Reformers in it.

First then, the scope of the Paragraph ought to have been considered, which is to speak of such Orders as were *inferiour to the Apostles and Bishops in Scripture-times*; of which they say that *express mention is made in Scripture onely of these two, (i. e.) Priests and Deacons*: To which two though the Church added *other inferiour and lower degrees* mentioned in ancient Writers (yet there is no mention of them in the Scripture, but) in some old Councils, and namely in the four *African*, where all the kinds of Orders be rehearsed. Now in that Council you may find the several Rites of Ordaining, 1. Bishops, 2. Presbyters, 3. Deacons, 4. Subdeacons, 5. Acolythi, 6. Exorcists, &c. And Canon 27. *ut Episcopus de loco ignobile ad nobilem non transeat, nec quisquam inferioris ordinis Clericus: Inferioris vero gradus Sacerdotes possunt concessione suorum Episcoporum ad alias Ecclesias migrare.* So that in the Judgment of that Council, Priests were an inferiour Order to Bishops; and consequently they were so in the Judgment of our Reformers, who quote it to that end. See *Binius Tom. i. p. 728.*

This also appears from the *Milevitan Council*, which is also quoted by the Reformers, in which *St. Augustine* was also present; wherein a Canon was made *Quo prohibetur ne Presbyteri, Diaconi,*
vel

30 No PROTESTANT, but

vel cæteri inferiores Clerici in causis suis ulla extra Africam adeant judicia. So that by both these Councils, *Priests* as well as *Deacons* are proved to be *inferiour* to *Bishops*: which was the thing intended by our Reformers in that Paragraph.

So that when these *Dissenters* (from this passage, (*viz.*) that of *these two Orders onely*, (i. e.) *Priests and Deacons*, *Scripture maketh expresse mention*) do in the words immediately following infer, That *all others* (meaning particularly that of *Bishops*) were afterward added by the Church, p. 2. and name this inference as if it were the very words of that excellent Book, is no less a sin, than the bearing false witness against them; for they treat onely of other inferior and lower degrees. So that if the word *Order* be taken in the first sence, for the power or faculty of administering holy things conferred by the *Bishops*, it is their plain sence, That *the Scripture maketh expresse mention of these two inferior Orders onely*, (i. e.) *Priests and Deacons*, and not of *Subdeacons*, *Acolytes*, &c.

Moreover, two things especially seem designed by the Reformers concerning the *Sacrament of Orders*: The first is to shew that *Bishops* are of Divine Institution, and had not their dependance on the Pope, whom his Favourites made the Only Bishop, and all the rest deriving their power and authority from him. The second was to shew, that of all those *seven Orders* which were made *Sacramental*, onely those of *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons* had foundation in Scripture; the rest

rest were added in after-times. And to confirm both these, they describe the manner of ordaining both Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in the Holy Scripture, to discharge it from those superstitious Ceremonies introduced by the Pope, and made necessary to their Ordination. As for the *Superiority* of Bishops to Priests, there is no question made, much less of their *Identity* or *sameness* of Office.

For the Divine Right of Bishops, they assert it in four several places, that they have it from Christ; and prove it by SS. and from thence infer this Conclusion, That whereas the Bishop of *Rome* hath heretofore claimed and usurped to be Head and governour of all Bishops and Priests of the Catholick Church, by the Laws of God; it is evident that his power is utterly feigned and untrue, and was neither given him by God in H. SS. nor allowed by the Fathers in ancient General Councils, nor by consent of the Catholick Church. And they declare, That the Authorities, Powers, and Jurisdictions of Patriarchs, Primate, Archbishops, and Metropolitans, were given them by the positive Laws of men onely, and not by any Ordinance of God in Holy SS. And the power usurped by any one Bishop over another, (not given him by the Consent of men) is no lawful Power, but plain Usurpation and Tyranny: Which they prove from the ancient Councils and Fathers against the Pope. Secondly, They shew, that of those *seven Orders* owned by the Church of *Rome* as *Sacramental*, onely Bishops, Priests, and

32 No PROTESTANT, but

and Deacons, had their Institution in the Holy SS. and that Subdeacons, Acolytes, Exorcists, &c. were added by the Church, as also the Rites and Ceremonies by which they were conferred. And thirdly, to confirm what they had said, they describe the manner of ordaining Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, to clear it from those superstitious Ceremonies brought in by the Church of *Rome*; as the Ring and Crosier-staff, several Unctions and Garments, some of which must come from *Rome*; whereas the SS. mentions onely the imposition of Hands and Prayers. In these words, *Of these two Orders onely, (i. e.) Priests and Deacons, the SS. maketh expresse mention; and how they were conferred of the Apostles by Prayer and imposition of their Hands.* And evident it is to me, that by the word *Orders* they intended onely the manner of Ordaining, not the distinction of Orders: for they all held the Superiority of Bishops to Priests. And this will appear, first, from the word used by the Latine Translation, which is, *De his tantum Ordinationibus*, of these Ordinations onely, not of these two Orders onely, the SS. makes mention, and describeth the manner of conferring them. And doubtless those learned men did not confound the words *Ordo* and *Ordinatio*. For the understanding whereof, I shall explain the English Edition by the Latine.

Thus in the beginning they say, *That these Orders were given by the Consecration and Imposition of the Bishops hands: [Per Consecrationem & Imposi-*

positionem manum Episcopi. And, as the Apostles themselves in the beginning of the Church did order Priests and Bishops; so they willed the other Bishops to do the like. Thus the Latine Book: *Et Quemadmodum Apostoli ipsi Episcopos & Presbyteros Ordinaverunt, ita, eosdem etiam instituisse ut in posterum succedentes Episcopi eundem ordinandi morem in Ecclesia servarent.* Again, *Here is to be noted, That although this Form before declared is to be observed in giving Orders, &c. in the Latine, Quamquam autem hunc in modum Scriptura Ordinationes fieri instituit.* Again, *Thus we have briefly touched the Ordering, not the Orders of Priests and Bishops.* The Latine, *Hactenus quidem de Ordinatione Presbyterorum.* Neither speak of the Order, but Ordering. Moreover, touching the Order of Deacons, we read *Acts* 6, that they were ordered and instituted by the same Apostles by Prayer and Imposition of their hands. The Latine, *Jam vero præter Episcopos & Sacerdotes, Diaconorum etiam Scriptura meminit, traditque hos ab Apostolis per Orationem & manuum impositionem ordinatos & institutos fuisse.* After all which it followeth, *Of these two Orders onely,* (which I cannot understand (the premises being considered) in any other sence than as the Latine renders it) *Of these Ordinations onely, and how they were conferred, the SS. maketh mention, That they were conferred by Prayer and imposition of hands.* Nor can it be thought that by the mentioning the *manner of ordaining Bishops*

and Priests to be the same, that therefore the Reformers thought the Order to be the same; but in cause the Deacons were ordained in the same manner, and yet it is granted that they were distinct Orders. And for the distinction of the Orders of Priests and Bishops, enough had been spoken before, and their present practice did demonstrate what their Opinions were.

If any desire farther satisfaction in these things, let him read the *Casists de Sacramento Ordinis*, where this distinction is obvious: *Ordo significat vel ipsam potestatem, vel Ordinationem quæ potestatem dat.* And they may find that *Bellarmin*, and generally the *Jesuits*, reckon Bishops and Priests to be but one Order, as our *Dissenters* would have it; and among the later School-men it was made a Question, *An Episcopatus sit Ordo à Presbyteratu distinctus*; and they generally hold that they are one in *Genere Sacerdotis*, but are distinct in *Specie*; the Episcopal Character including that of a Priest; and so they hold that *Solum Sacramentum est Ordo & Sacramentum*. So they dispute against the imposition of hands in Ordination of Priests, and the usual form was by delivering the Patine and Chalice, with Bread and Wine, with these words, *Accipe potestatem offerendi Sacrificia pro vivis & mortuis. In nomina Patris, &c.* And they affirm, That the Pope can create a Bishop or Priest, only by saying, *Be thou a Bishop or a Priest*. A Deacon is ordained by delivering of the Gospels into his hands, and the Subdeacon by delivery of an *an-*

pty Patine and Chalice : Which superstitious uses our Reformers would destroy, and reduce to the Apostolical practice.

The third particular to evince the sense of our Reformers concerning the divine Institution of Bishops, and their Superiority to Priests, is the sense of other moderate Divines of that Age: (for the Judgment of our own Divines shall be sufficiently shewn from Dr. *Stillingsfleet's* MS. as well as from the *Necessary Erudition*.) And this I shall shew, from the Opinion of several great Divines in the Council of *Trent* (which I quote not to assert the authority of that Council, but to shew what was aimed at by such as thought there was a necessity of reforming the Church of *Rome* in these points.) That Council was summoned within a year or two after the Edition of the *Necessary Erudition* in the Latine Tongue. In this Council the Spanish and French Divines, with some others, with great Learning and good Authorities defend against the Popes Party, 1. The Institution of Bishops to be by Divine right; and 2. That they had Superiority over Priests by the same Institution. For as Dr. *Burnet* observeth, (of which hereafter) it was the designe of the Romanists to depress the Order of Bishops, for the advancing of the Popes Authority; affirming, That their principal place and authority depended on the Pope; and made the *Cardinals*, who were but *Priests* or *Deacons*, their Superiours. Both these points were opposed by the

36 No PROTESTANT, but

whole Court of *Rome*, and the Italian Clergy, by *Layne* the General of the Jesuits, no friends to Bishops, who made a Speech of two hours long against them. Against whom, *Granata*, *Melchior Canus*, and the Bishop of *Segovia*, with many other great Prelates, disputed, and answered all his Arguments. This later alledged, that in the Council under Pope *Julius* the Third, and by his consent, it was resolved, *That those are not to be hearkned unto, who say that Bishops are not instituted Jure Divino; it appearing manifestly by the Word of the Gospel, that Christ our Lord hath himself called the Apostles, and promoted them to the degree of Apostleship; into whose place the Bishops are subrogated.* Neither ought we to think that so eminent and necessary a degree hath been brought into the Church by humane Institution; for so we should detract from and disesteem that Divine providence, for failing in the most noble things. To this was added a Canon (which saith) *He that shall say that Bishops are not instituted Jure Divino, or that they are not superiour to Priests, or have not authority to ordain, or that this doth belong to Priests, Let him be Anathema.* Moreover, those Divines urged that *Epiphanius* and *St. Augustine* noted *Aërius* for an Heretick for saying, *That Priests are equal to Bishops*: Which they would not have done, if Bishops had not been *Jure Divino*. Moreover, *Petrus Soto*, who had disputed against Bishops in the Council, recanted; and three days before his death sent a Letter to the Pope, desiring it might be

be declared, That the Institution of Bishops is *Jure Divino*. The Popes Party perceiving the great opposition that they were like to meet with, perswaded the Legates to declare against it. Cardinal *Varmiense* would have put it off as a needless Dispute, saying, That both Catholicks and Hereticks were agreed in it (*viz.*) that Bishops are *Jure Divino*. And others, to divert the Spanish and French from this point, proposed the business of Reformation; and they wrote frequently to the Pope for his direction, it being a point wherein his Holiness's Grandeur was much concern'd, and for the resolution whereof, the Holy Ghost (as some said) was often sent from *Rome* to *Trent* in a Cloak-bag. And in truth, the Resolution of it would have been very fatal to the Court of *Rome*: for on this concession it would have followed, That the power of the Keys was not given to *Peter* onely; That the Council was above the Pope; That Bishops were equal to him; That the dignity of *Cardinals*, who being but Priests or *Deacons*, advanced themselves above Bishops, was taken away; That *Preventions*, *Reservations*, *Appeals*, &c. were removed, and the *Collations* of *Benefices* would return to the Bishops.

And the Bishop of *Segovia* had refused to admit one to a *Benefice* which was given him by the Pope, in vindication of the Right of Bishops. In this Council also they pleaded for the Rite of Imposition of hands in Ordination; (from whence Ordination was called *χειροθεσία*) which the Pope

38 No PROTESTANT, but

had changed into another Rite of delivering the Chalice, and other Vessels and Garments, laying aside that Scriptural Rite.

All this and much more may be seen in the seventh book of the History of the Council of Trent; by which it appears, that the moderate Clergy among the Papists in that Age, did defend, with our Reformers, the divine Authority of Bishops, their Superiority over Priests, and the manner of Ordination by Imposition of hands, against the superstitious Ceremonies introduced by the Church of Rome. And though they could not fully obtain their desires, yet they prevailed for these Canons in that Council. Canon 2. *Si quis dixerit præter Sacerdotium non esse in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ alios Ordines, & Majores & Minores, per quos, velut per gradus, quosdam in Sacerdotium tendatur, Anathema sit.* Canon 6. *Si quis dixerit in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ non esse Hierarchiam divinâ Ordinatione institutam, quæ constat ex Episcopis, Presbyteris, & Ministris, Anathema sit.* Canon 7. *Si quis dixerit Episcopos non esse Presbyteris Superiores, vel non habere potestatem Confrmandi ac Ordinandi, vel eam quam habent illis esse cum Presbyteris communem, Anathema sit.* And as they speak the same sence, so they use almost the same words with our Reformers. So Cap. 4. *Sancta Synodus declarat præter cæteros Ecclesiasticos gradus Episcopos qui in locum Apostolorum successerunt, ad hunc Ecclesiasticum ordinem præcipue pertinere, & positos, sicut ait Apostolus a Spiritu San-*
cto

esto regere Ecclesiam Dei, eosque Presbyteris Superiores esse, Acts 20. And having thus asserted the Order and Superiority of Bishops, they speak as our Reformers do: for, *cap. 2.* of that Synod, they say, *Non solum de Sacerdotibus, sed & de Diaconis Sacrae Literae apertam mentionem faciunt*; where by mentioning these two, they do not exclude Bishops, but rather under the word *Sacerdos*, they include Bishops, whom they stile *Summos Sacerdotes*: and our Reformers include both under the words *Priesthood* and *Priests*, in the Chapter of Orders: As when they translate that of *1 Tim. 4. 14.* *by the hands of the Priesthood*, (i.e.) *the Apostles hands*; as by comparing it with *2 Tim. 1. 6.* it appears.

One Argument more these *Dissenters* mention from the *Necessary Erudition*, as good as the rest, p. 3. *The Order of a Bishop or Priest is one and the same, whose Office is not onely to preach and administer Sacraments, but moreover to exercise Discipline, namely in assoyling and loosng from sin such as be truly penitent, and in excommunicating the obstinately vicious*; where from the Community of some Offices, they would argue to the equality of the Orders: though nothing is more evident, than that the Bishops of this Age reserved the power of *Confirmation, Ordination, and Diocesan Jurisdiction* to themselves, as their Right *Jure Divino*, as will yet further appear. But nowhere doth the *Necessary Erudition* say, That the Order of a Bishop or Priest is one and the same,

40 No PROTESTANT, but

as they sophistically infer : And they may as well affirm it to be the fence of the Council of *Trent*, as of our Reformers, who use almost the same words, *Non solum Sacerdotibus, sed & de Diaconis, Sacrae Literæ apertam mentionem faciunt.*

I cannot conceive what ground these *Dissenters* had to fix this Errour of theirs upon, unless an unwary Expression of *Dr. Burnet's* ; who perhaps considering the Archbishops Judgment more than the Judgments of the rest, doth assert the same as the *Dissenters* do : But if they had it from him, they had also in him a correction of this Errour ; and it was far from the ingenuity of true Protestant Divines, to publish the Errour, and conceal the Confutation of it. Thus then *Dr. Burnet* discovers the whole Intrigue. *Dr. Burnet*, p. 336. of the first part, *That both in this Writing (i. e. Dr. Stillingfleet's Manuscript) and in the Necessary Erudition of a Christian man, Bishops and Priests are spoken of as one and the same Office.* But *Dr. Burnet* adds, *In the ancient Church they knew none of those subtilties which were found out in the later Ages ; it was then thought enough that a Bishop was to be dedicated to his Function by a new Imposition of hands, and that several Offices could not be performed without Bishops, such as Ordination, Confirmation, &c. But they did not refine in these matters so much as to enquire whether Bishops and Priests differed in Order and Office, or onely in degree : But after the School men fell to examine matters of Dignity with logical and unintelligible Niceties*

ceties, the Canonists began to comment upon the Rules of the ancient Church; they studied to make Bishops and Priests seem very near one to another, so that the difference was but small. They did it with different designs: The School-men having set up the grand Mystery of Transubstantiation, were to exalt the Priestly Office as much as was possible; for the turning of the Host into God, was so great an action, that they reckoned there could be no Office higher than that which qualified a man to so mighty a performance. Therefore as they changed the form of Ordination from what it was anciently believed to consist in, (viz.) Imposition of hands, to a delivering of sacred Vessels; and held that a Priest had his Orders by that Rite, not by the Imposition of hands: So they raised their Order or Office so high, as to make it equal with the Order of a Bishop. But as they designed to extol the Order of Priesthood; so the Canonists had as great a mind to depress the Episcopal Order; they generally wrote for preferment; and the way to it, was to extol the Papacy: Nothing could do that so effectually, as to bring down the power of Bishops; this onely could justifie the Exemptions of the Monks and Friars, the Popes setting up Legantine Courts, and receiving at first Appeals, and then original Causes before them, together with many other Encroachments on the Jurisdiction of Bishops; all which were unlawful, if the Bishops had by Divine Right Jurisdiction in their Diocesses: Therefore it was necessary to lay them as low as could be, and to make them think that the power they held was

42 No PROTESTANT, but

was rather as Delegates of the Apostolick See, than by a Commission from Christ or his Apostles. So that they looked on the declaring Episcopal Authority to be of Divine Right, as a blow that would be fatal to the Court of Rome; therefore they did after this at Trent, use all possible endeavours to hinder any such Decision: it having been then the common Stile of that Age, to reckon Bishops and Priests as the same Office, it is no wonder if at this time the Clergie of this Church, the greatest part of them being still leavened with the old Superstition, and the rest of them not having enough of spare-time to examine lesser matters, retain still the former Phrases in this particular.

This might have been sufficient to correct the forwardness of our *Dissenters* to comply with the Papists in this new Notion of Bishops or Priests as one Order; but because they abated nothing of their confidence by this, I shall mind them of that severer Reprimand of the Doctor's, for which in their behalf I give him hearty thanks, for I think he shall have none from them. It is in these words (NB)

On this I have insisted the more, that it may appear how little they have considered things, who are so far carried with their Zeal against the established Government of this Church, as to make much use of some passages of the School-men and Canonists that deny them to be distinct Orders: for these are the very dregs of Popery (N.B.) the one raising the Priests higher for the sake of Transubstantiation,
the

the other pulling the Bishops lower for the sake of the Popes Supremacy, and by such means bringing them almost to an equality. So partial are some men to their particular Conceits, that they make use of the most mischievous Topicks when they can serve their turn, not considering how much farther these Arguments will run if they ever admit them.

So that although the Phrase of *Priests* or *Bishops* might have been used in former times, as it was in a Paper printed among the *Addenda* to the first part of the Doctor's History, p. 324. which Paper was written about six years before the *Necessary Erudition*, as is proved, p. 365. of the first part: Yet when our *Dissenters* read (as no doubt they did) these Remarks of the Doctor's concerning the rise and mischievous tendencies of it, their presumption in urging it from that Paper where it is so shamefully condemned, is as unpardonable as their endeavour to fasten it on the *Necessary Erudition*, where the contrary is evidently asserted.

And is this the great Reverence that our *Dissenters* have for the first Reformers, thus to wrest and abuse their Writings, by altering their Words, curtailling their Sentences, and representing them as contradicting themselves, as well as the Universal Church in all Ages before them, in such an excellent Book, and to object that against them which their Adversaries who watched for such an advantage could never find? This is no otherwise to honour them, than to call them to a second

44 No PROTESTANT, but

cond Martyrdom, more inglorious and hateful to them than the first. And yet these *Dissenters* could not but know, that all they who had a hand in compiling that Book, were either Diocesan Bishops, or such Divines as lived in a willing submission to them. And these things are sufficient to shew, that the *Dissenters* are more genuine Sons of some other Church, than of the Church of *England* according to its Primitive Constitution.

Having seen how well these *Dissenters* have proved their Assertion concerning the *Primitive Constitution of our Church*, by their first Evidence, from the *Necessary Erudition*: we proceed now to consider what farther Evidence they have produced from the Records mentioned in Dr. *Burnet's* History, especially from the Manuscript of Dr. *Stillingfleet*; concerning which I shall onely mind these *Dissenters* of an Observation of their own, viz. *That though some of these Reformers were of different Opinions as to some points mentioned in this Manuscript, yet they must be considered to have receded from them when they subscribed the Necessary Erudition, being then all of that Judgment which is there described.*

The intent of printing Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Manuscript containing the Resolutions of the Archbishop and several Bishops and Divines of some Questions concerning the Sacraments, was, as Dr. *Burnet* says, that it might appear with what maturity and care they proceeded in the Reformation. And the Subscriptions which were at the

the end of every mans Paper, he tells us, p. 242. were in this form: T. Cant. *This is my Opinion and Sentence; which I do not temerariouſly deſine, but do remit the Judgment thereof wholly to your Maſteſty*—and as is alſo ſometimes expreſſed, p. 201. *without prejudice to the Truth, and ſaving always more better Judgment: Cum facultate etiam melius deliberandi in hac parte.* Now this Conſultation was ſome years before the Book was publiſhed; and if any of the Biſhops had been then of a contrary Opinion, as the *Diſſenters* obſerve that Archb. Crammer was in the caſe of Excommunication, inclining to *Erastianism*, from theſe they muſt be conſidered, (ſay the *Diſſenters*) to have receded, becauſe they ſubſcribed the *Necessary Excommunication*: p. 8. This Manuſcript ſpeaks home to our purpoſe in

Queſt. 9. *Whether the Apoſtles lacking a higher power, as in not having a Chriſtian King among them, made Biſhops by that neceſſity, or by authority given by God?*

The Answer of the Archbiſhop to this Queſtion, as indeed to many others, is ſingular, and differs from the reſt of the Reformers; being, as the *Prefacers* themſelves do obſerve, meer *Erastianism*, p. 7. but from theſe alſo (as they ſay of his Opinion concerning Excommunication, p. 8.)

46 No PROTESTANT, but

he must be considered to have receded, because he subscribed the *Necessary Erudition*; which being done on more mature deliberation, we ought to impute nothing to the Archbishop as his judgment in those controverted Points, but what is there by him asserted. I shall therefore mention the Resolutions of the rest only as we find them in the *Recollection*; only of this first I shall speak at large.

York. We find in SS. that the Apostles used the power to make Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; which power may be grounded upon these words: *Sicut misit me vivens Pater, sic ego mitto vos.* And we verily think that they durst not have used so high a power, unless they had had authority from Christ. But that their power to ordain Bishops, Priests, or Deacons, by Imposition of hands, requireth any other authority than authority of God, we neither read in SS. nor out of SS.

London. I think the Apostles made Bishops by the Law of God, because Acts 22. it is said. *In quo vos Spiritus Sanctus posuit.* Nevertheless I think if Christian Princes had been then, they should have named by Right, and appointed the said Bishops to their places.

Rocheſter. I think that the Apostles made Bishops by authority given them from God.

Canliſton. That Christ made his Apostles Priests and Bishops, and that he gave them power to make others, it seemeth to be the very Trade of SS.

Dr. Robertſon. I think the Apostles made Bishops and Presbyters by divine authority, where the publick Magistrate did permit it.

Dr.

Dr. Cox. Although the Apostles had no authority to force any man to be Priests, yet (they moved by the Holy Ghost) had authority of God to exhort and induce men to set forth Gods honour, and so to make them Priests.

Dr. Day. The Apostles ordained Bishops by authority given them by God. Joh. 20. Sicut misit me, &c. Item Joh. ult. & Acts 20. & 1 Tim. 4. Paulus ordinavit Timotheum & Titum, & prescribit quales ille debeant ordinare, 1 Tim. 1. Tit. 1.

Dr. Oglethorp. The Apostles by authority and command of God, did ordain and institute Bishops, leave being desired and obtained from the Prince or Magistrate who was then chief. As I suppose.

Dr. Redman. Christ gave his Apostles authority to make Bishops and Ministers in his Church, as he had received authority of the Father to make them Bishops. But if any Christian Prince had then been, the Apostles had been and ought to have been obedient Subjects, and would have attempted nothing but under the permission and assent of their earthly Governours. Yet was it meet that they which were special and elect Servants of our Saviour Christ, and were sent by him to convert the World, and having most abundantly the Holy Ghost in them, should have special ordering of such Ministry as pertained to the planting and increasing of the Faith: whereunto I doubt not but a Christian Prince of his godly mind would most loingly have condescended. And it is to be considered in this Question, with other like, this word

48 No PROTESTANT, but

word making a Bishop or Priest, may be taken two ways: for understanding the word to ordain or consecrate, so it is a thing which pertaineth to the Apostles and their Successours only; but if by this word (making) be understood the appointing or naming to the Office, so it pertaineth specially to the supream Heads and Governours of the Church, which be Princes.

Dr. Edgworth. The Apostles made Bishops and Priests by authority given them of God, and not for lack of any higher power: notwithstanding, where there is a Christian King or Prince, the election, deputation, and assignation of them that shall be Priests and Bishops, belongeth to the King or Prince, so that he may forbid any Bishop within his Kingdom that he give no Orders, for considerations moving him; and may assigne him a time when he shall give Orders, and to whom: Example of King David, 1 Chron. 24. dividing the Levites into twenty four Orders, deputing over every Order one chief Bishop; prescribing an Ordinal and Rule how they should do their duties and courses: and what Sacrifices, Rites and Ceremonies they should use every day, as the day and time required. And his Son King Solomon diligently executed and commanded the same usages to be observed in the Temple, after he had erected and finished it, 2 Chron. 8.

Dr. Symmons. The Apostles made Bishops and Priests by authority given them of God.

Dr. Tresham. The Apostles had authority of God to make Bishops: yet if there had been a Christian

King

King

King in any place where they made Bishops, they would and ought to have desired authority of him for the executing of such Godly acts; which no Christian King would have denied.

Dr. Leighton. *The Apostles, as I suppose, made Bishops by authority given to them of Christ: howbeit I think they would and should have required the Christian Princes consent and license thereto, if there had been any Christian Kings or Princes.*

Dr. Coren. *The Apostles made Bishops and Priests by authority given them of God: Notwithstanding, if there had been a Christian King at that time, it had been their duties to have had his license and permission thereto.*

Here you see they all affirm that the Apostles, by authority from God, did make Bishops as well as Priests and Deacons; and that there needs no other authority for their Successours to do the like, but what is given them of God. Now that they were distinct Orders, will appear by the next Question.

Quest. 10. *Whether Bishops or Priests were first? and if the Priest were first, then the Priest made the Bishop?*

The Bishop of St. Davids, my Lord elect of Westminster, Dr. Cox, and Dr. Redman say, That at the beginning they were all One. The Bishops of York, London, Rochester, Carlisle, Drs. Day, Tresham, Symmons, Oglethorp, be in other contrary Opinions.

50 No PROTESTANT, but

nions. The Bishop of *Tork* and Dr. *Tresham* think that the *Apostles* first were *Priests*, and after were made *Bishops*; when the overseeing of other *Priests* was committed to them. My Lords of *London*, *Duresm*, *Carlisle*, and *Rochester*, Drs. *Symmons* and *Grayford*, think that the *Apostles* were first *Bishops*, and they after made other *Bishops* and *Priests*. Drs. *Coren* and *Oglethorp* say, That the *Apostles* were made *Bishops*, and the seventy two were after made *Priests*. Dr. *Day* thinks that *Bishops*, as they are now called, were before *Priests*. My Lord of *London*, Drs. *Edgworth* and *Robertson*, think it no inconvenience if a *Priest* made a *Bishop* in that time.

Quest. II. Whether a Bishop hath authority to make a Priest by the SS. or no? and whether any other but onely a Bishop may make a Priest?

To the former part of the Question the Bishop of *St. Davids* doth answer, That *Bishops* have no authority to make *Priests*, unless they be authorized of the *Christian Prince*. The others do all say, That they be authorized of *God*. Yet some of them adde, That they cannot use their authority, without their *Christian Prince* doth permit them. To the second part, the Answer of the Bishop of *St. Davids* is, That *Lay-men* have otherwhile made *Priests*. So doth Drs. *Edgworth* and *Redman* say,
That

the DISSENTERS Plot. 51

That Moses, by a priviledge given him of God, made Aaron his brother Priest. Drs. Tresham, Grayford, and Cox, say, That Lay men may make Priests in time of necessity. The Bishops of York, Duresm, Rochester, Carlisle, Elect of Westminster, Drs. Coren, Leighton, Symmons, seem to deny this thing: for they say, They find not nor read not any such Example.

Quest. 12. *Whether in the New Testament be required any Consecration of a Bishop and Priest, or onely appointing to the Office be sufficient?*

The Bishop of St. Davids saith, That onely the appointing. And Dr. Cox, That onely the appointing cum manuum impositione is sufficient, without Consecration. The Bishops of York, London, Duresm, Carlisle, Drs. Day, Coren, Leighton, Tresham, Edgworth, Oglethorp, say, That Consecration is requisite. Dr. Redman saith, That Consecration hath been from the Apostles time, and instituted of the Holy Ghost, to confer Grace. My Lord of Rochester, Drs. Day and Symmons say, The Priesthood is given per manuum impositionem, and that by Scripture; and that Consecration hath of long time been received in the Church.

Quest. 16. *Whether a Bishop or Priest*

52 No PROTESTANT, but
*may excommunicate, and for what Crimes ;
and whether they onely may excommunicate
by Gods Law ?*

The Bishops of York, Duresm, and Edgworth, say,
*That Lay-men have not the authority to excommuni-
cate, but that it was given onely to the Apostles and
their Successors.* The Bishops of Hereford, St. Davids,
Westminster, Drs. Day, Coren, Leighton, Cox, Sym-
mons, say, *That Lay-men may excommunicate if they
be appointed by the high Ruler.* My Lord Elect
of Westminster, Drs. Tresham, Oglethorp, say fur-
ther, *That the power of Excommunication was given
to the Church, and to such as the Church shall insti-
tute.*

So that in this Paper, which contains a previous
Consultation (some years before) to the things
published in the *Necessary Erudition*, they did ge-
nerally agree, That the Office of Bishops is men-
tioned in Scripture; That they were of a supe-
riour Order to Priests; That the Apostles made
Bishops by authority from God, and left their
Successours power to do the like. And to this
they all subscribed in the *Necessary Erudition*.

Much more might be added from some pub-
lick Writings of that Age, of which I shall name
but one or two; as first, the Book called *Refor-
matio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*; a designe first be-
gun by King Henry the Eighth, prosecuted by
Edward the Sixth, as by their two Orders prefixed

to that Book, doth appear ; and committed to the care of thirty two *Divines* and *Civilians*, the Archbishop being the chief ; wherein it is ordered, *That to the Bishop all are to give obedience according to the Word of God*, p. 98. *Episcopo qui Ecclesiæ præficitur, non solum Decanus, Archidiaconus, Archipresbyter, & reliqui Ministri parebunt, &c.* And cap. 10. *Episcopi, quoniam inter cæteros Ecclesiæ Ministros, locum principem tenent, ideo sana Doctrinâ gravi autoritate atque provido consilio debent interiores Ordines Cleri regere ac pascere.* Dr. Burnet, p. 71. of the second part, says, *It is plain that Cranmer had quite laid aside those singular Opinions which he formerly held of the Ecclesiastical Functions : for now in a Work of his own, without the concurrence of any other (speaking of his Catechism) he fully sets forth their Divine Institution.*

But of this enough hath been said ; I shall now give a brief Character of this great Archbishop, and then propose him as an Example of Modesty and Condescension in points of Government and Discipline, to these *Dissenters*.

He was a person of extraordinary Learning, (considering the Age in which he lived) a Doctor of Divinity in *Cambridge*, an indefatigable Student, that had digested the Doctrine of the Fathers^s and Councils into his Common-place-books, which consisted of several Volumes. He gave the first fatal blow to the Pope : for King *Henry* being almost wearied by the Popes Delays

54 No PROTESTANT, but

and Bulls, was ready to yield. But coming to *Waltham*, where Dr. *Cranmer* had retired because of a great Sickness in *Cambridge*, some of the Council happened into his company, who told the Doctor how much the King was troubled at the Popes dealing with him; and desired his advice what might be done in it. To whom the Doctor answered, That *it would be a short and safe way to clear the business of the Kings Marriage, if it be proved unlawful in it self, by vertue of a divine prohibition: for the Popes Dispensation could not make that lawful, which God had made unlawful.* This seasonable and pertinent advice was speedily told the King, who was much taken with it; and sent immediately for the Doctor, asking him whether he would stand to what he said. The Doctor modestly replied, That *it was his present Judgment, but besought the King, for his better satisfaction, that the judgment of the Universities might be had in it.* Which being done, they confirmed Dr. *Cranmer's* Advice; which was more corroborated by the Judgment of *forreign Divines and Universities*: And this animated the King to an irreconcilable breach with the Church of *Rome*. After this, the King took him into his special favour, and found him a person of so great Integrity and Ability, that he employed him in several Embassies to *France* and *Germany*. And though that King had cast off many great Favourites, such as Cardinal *Wolsey* and *Cromwel*; and although this Doctor had many great Adversaries; yet the King

King defended him against them all. He gave him the Archbishoprick while he was beyond the Seas ; where he tarried as long as he could, hoping that the King might prefer some other before his return, he being unwilling to accept of it.

Yet this learned Archbishop, this great favourite to such a resolute Prince, never undertook any thing of publick concern upon his own Opinion , but consulted with his brethren of the Clergy, and caused the matters in question to be argued by them ; and being convinced by their Arguments, he renounced his own Opinions, and subscribed to theirs. How contrary are the actings of our *Dissenters* to these of our first Reformer ? They are but a few private persons ; they have entertained new and strange Opinions, such as were never broached in the world before, such as are against the Scripture, against the Laws of the Land, against the Constitution of our Church, and of the forreign Churches that deserve the name of *Reformed* ; they have for acting so far, already incurred their Princes just displeasure, and lie under great penalties of the Laws ; yet in defiance of the Laws, and to provoke the King to his face, they presume to offer him a *Model for the Subversion of the established Government*, and to erect such a one as is against the King's declared Resolution, his Oath, and Conscience, and such a one as hath once already ruined *King, Church, and State.*

56 No PROTESTANT, but

I should think it some satisfaction to the reputation of these Reformers, if after these misrepresentations of them, they would condescend so far as to learn these few plain and seasonable Lessons from their *Necessary Erudition*, such as follow.

In the Chap. of Orders. *Although the Office and Ministry of Priests and Bishops stand chiefly in the things before rehearsed, yet neither they nor any of them may exercise and execute any of the same Offices, but with such sort and such limitation as the Ordinances and Laws of every Christian Realm do permit and suffer.*

And speaking of the Right of Christian Kings, they say, *That to them it belongeth specially and principally to defend the Faith of Christ and his Religion; to conserve and maintain the true Doctrine of Christ, and all such as be true Preachers and Setters forth thereof; to abolish all Abuses, Heresies, and Idolatries; and to punish with corporal pains such as of malice be the occasion of the same.*

On the fourth Commandment. They teach us to observe and not despise such laudable Ceremonies of the Church as set forth Gods honour, and appertain to good Order to be used in the Church, and therefore concerning such Ceremonies of the Church as have been institute by our Forefathers, and be allowed by the Princes or Kings of the Dominions, which next to God be the chief Heads of the Churches. *Although men ought not to have so fond opinion of the said Ceremonies, to think that they have power to remit sins, yet they be very expedient things to excite or*
stir

stir up mens Devotion, and to cause them to have the more reverence towards the Sacraments.

On the fifth Commandment. *Subjects be bound not to withdraw their Fealty, Truth, Love, and Obedience towards their Prince, FOR ANY CAUSE WHATSOEVER IT BE, ne for any cause may they conspire against his person, ne do any thing towards the hinderance and hurt thereof, nor of his Estate; and by this Commandment they be bound to obey also all the Laws, Proclamations, Precepts, and Commandments made by their Princes and Governours, except they be against the Commandments of God. And likewise they be bound to obey all such as be in Authority under their Prince, as far as he will have them obeyed; they must also give unto their Prince aid, help, and assistance, whensoever he shall require the same, either for surety, preservation, or maintenance of his Person and Estate, or of the Realm, or of the defence of any of the same against all persons. And there be many Examples in SS. of the great Vengeance of God that hath fallen upon Rulers, and such as have been disobedient to their Princes: But one principal Example to be noted, is, of the Rebellion which Core, Dathan, and Abiram made against their Governours Moses and Aaron; for punishment of which Rebels, God not onely caused the Earth to open and to swallow them, down, and a great number of other people with them with their houses and all their substance, but caused also the fire to descend from Heaven and to burn up two hundred and fifty Captains which conspired with*
the m

58 No PROTESTANT, but

them in the Rebellion. Moreover, all Christian men be bound by this Commandment, to exhibite due honour and reverence to the spiritual Fathers and Parents which have cure and charge of their Souls, as unto those who be appointed by God to minister his Sacraments to the people, to feed them with his Word, and by the same to conduct and lead them the straight way to the Father in Heaven everlasting. And our Saviour Christ in the Gospel maketh mention as well of the obedience as of the corporal sustenance which all Christian people do owe to their Spiritual Fathers: Of the Obedience, he saith, Whosoever receiveth you receiveth me, and he that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me. And St. Paul saith, Obey your Prelates, and give place to them: for they have much charge and much care for your Souls, as they that must give an account: therefore, that they may do it with joy and not with grief, (i. e.) that they may gladly and with much comfort do their care and charge when they do perceive that the people be obedient to their Teaching, like as contrariwise though they be bound to do it, yet the people give them little comfort to do it, when they find them disobedient and repugnant.

And on the sixth Commandment. No Subjects may draw their Swords against their Prince for any cause whatsoever it be, nor against any other (saving for lawful defence) without their Princes license. And it is their duty to draw their Swords for the defence of their Prince and Realm, whensoever the Prince shall command. And although Prin-
ces,

ces, which be the chief and supreme Heads of their Realms, do otherwise than they ought, yet God hath assigned no Judges over them in this world, but will have the Judgment of them reserved to himself.

Another reasonable Lesson they give on the ninth Commandment. *When we know any man to do amiss, not to publish his fault to other men to his slander, but rather to admonish him privily, and to seek his reformation ; to speak well by our Enemies ; to excuse them and answer for them that be unjustly slandered ; and generally in all other things to use our Tongues in truth to the wealth of our Neighbours. Against this Commandment offend all they which by lying and uttering of false speech deceive and hurt any man ; and such Lyars be the Devils Children : for, as St. John saith in his Gospel, The Devil is a Lyar and the Father of Lyars ; and therefore bid-deth St. Paul, That we should put away lying, and speak truth every man to his Neighbour. They also offend against this Commandment, which be detra-ctors, back-biters, and slanderers, whom the wise man doth liken to Serpents that privily bite or sting men behind when they be not ware thereof : and surely such men, whatever they pretend, go not about to heal and amend them that do amiss, but rather do satisfie their own malice and slanderous Tongues : for like as the Surgeon that will heal a wound, doth cover it and bind it that it take no open air ; so if we intend the amendment of our Neighbours fault, we must not open it abroad to his hurt, but must be sorry and pray to God for him, &c.*

For

60 No PROTESTANT, but

For the Fuller satisfaction of my Readers, I shall set down the Opinions for which our *Dissenters* noted this Archbishop to be too *Erastian*; which I suppose are these.

To Quest. 10. *That Princes and Governours may make Priests by the authority of God committed to them, and the People also by their Election: for as we read that Bishops have done it, so Christian Emperours and Princes usually have done it; and the People before Christian Princes were, commonly did elect their Bishops and Priests.*

And to the eleventh Question. *In the New Testament he that is appointed to be a Bishop or Priest, needs no Consecration by the scripture; for their Election or appointing thereunto, is sufficient.*

And concerning Excommunication, *That a Bishop or Priest by the Scripture, is neither commanded nor forbidden to excommunicate, but where the Laws of any Region give him authority.*

This Opinion of the Archbishops is so contrary to the power which the *Congregational Bishops* expect, that they expressly condemn it of *Erastianism*, (*i. e.* a too great dependance on the Magistrate) so that it is no great wonder if he might sometime hold, *That Bishops and Priests were at one time, and were no two things, but both one Office in the beginning of Christs Religion.*

These men might (and I suppose did) read in Dr. Burnet's History, p. 280. this account of these Opinions. In Crammer's Papers some singular Opinion of his about Ecclesiastical Affairs, will be found.

found. But as they are delivered by him with all possible modesty, so they were not established as the Doctrine of the Church, but laid aside as particular Conceits of his own. And it seems that he afterward changed his Opinion: for he subscribed the Book, (*i.e.*) the *Necessary Erudition*.

A very Heathen would abhor such indirect dealing, not onely to conceal a Truth which they well knew, but to print the contrary, (*viz.*) *That the other Reformers were of Archbishop Cranmer's Judgment in the time of Edward the Sixth*: whereas Dr. Burnet in more than one or two places, shews that the Archbishop was of their Judgment in the days of *Henry the Eighth*, and never changed it afterward. But their laying such a Brat of their own at the doors of the Archbishop and first Reformers, is such a way of *honouring* them, as the *Dissenters* have used to all their Governours in Church and State, (*i.e.*) by *slandering the footsteps of Gods Anointed*.

And when it is evident with what great confidence these men do misreport matters of fact, adde to, alter, and detract from, such Publick and Considerable Writings; how they dismember the Records of the Ancients, reciting what makes for their interest, and suppressing whatever is against it: what little reason have we to believe that the Disputes which they maintain about *Liturgies*, *Episcopacy*, and *Ceremonies*, are matters of Conscience, and such as they really apprehend to be sinful; but rather Scruples invented to intangle the

62 No PROTESTANT, but

the People, and to facilitate their designs of Envy and Ambition?

The sin of Suborning Witnesses to testify an Untruth against the Life or Reputation, though but of a *private person*, is justly abhorred, and deserves to be severely punished by a retaliation of those wrongs to which such false Witnesses would have betrayed them. See *Deut. chap. 19. 16, 17, &c.*

*Nec lex est justior ulla,
Quam necis artifices arte perire suæ.*

But the sin of raising false Evidences against a *well-established Government*, thereby not onely to disgrace, but utterly destroy it, deserves a greater punishment, the intended mischief being much more general. And when the *Leaders* of the people, who have the chief conduct of their Consciences, use vile practices, it will raise a suspicion that their *Profelytes* do not much abhor them.

But they tell us of other Writings published in *Henry the Eighth's time*, *That may encline a judicious mind to conclude that the Office of a Priest and Bishop is the same*: for this they quote a Treatise of one *Lambert of Avynion*, which they would perswade us to be of great authority, and that the Opinion was very common at that time, because its Translation was dedicated to *Queen Anne*: as if they should say, All that is in our *Reply* is true, and is the common Opinion of our Age, because we have dedicated it to the Right Honou-

Honourable the Earld of *Hallifax*, who is known to be one of his Majesties most Honourable Privy Council: Although such bold Dedications argue onely the impudence of the Authors, who abuse such great Names to gain some colour to their Opinions, against the established Government; such as was that of *Lambert*, viz. *That every Parish ought to have its proper Bishop, and in every City, Town, and Village, there ought to be many Bishops*: with other such-like; of which the *Dissenters* say, (how truly, I hope others will consider) That *within seven years after, this Opinion was declared to be the Sense of the Church of England, as they have evinced out of the Necessary Erudition.*

And yet after all these Defamations of our Reformers, Mr. *Lob* hath the confidence to boast, That *the Reputation of the first Reformation is not in the least blasted by the Dissenters*, p. 67. of the Reply: And when he tells us, p. 62. *That the Presbyterian Discipline, (i. e.) the Government of Gospel-Churches by Presbyters and Deacons, &c. is a Discipline the truth of which hath been sealed by the Blood of blessed Protestant Martyrs; a thing in which our Episcoparians cannot make their boast*: Is not this to exclude our Reforming Bishops *Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper*, and those Divines that suffered in the same Cause, from Martyrdom?

I shall therefore entreat Mr. *Lob*, after his evincing with so much demonstration, *That he hath not in the least blasted the Reputation of our first*

64 No PROTESTANT, but

first Reformers, to give us but one probable Argument that he hath not demonstrated the contrary. And certainly if we had had no Reformers in those days but such as contended for a *Presbyterian Discipline Jure Divino*, we had had no Reformation to this day. For I hope these *Dissenters*, who boast so much of their Religion and Loyalty, have yet more grace than to call that a Reformation which in *Forty two* was begun by an open and unnatural Rebellion against the best of Kings, and written in his Bloud, and reduced both Church and State into such Bloudguiltiness and horrid Confusions, as we are not purged from to this day.

But there is yet a fifth Assertion grounded on the *Necessary Erudition*: p. 4. of the Preface. ----
 5. *That the Superiority of one Bishop over another, or of a Bishop over a Presbyter, is of humane, not of divine Right: Concerning this (say they) the Necessary Erudition is most expresse, in these words: Whereas we have summarily declared what is the Office and Ministration which in Holy Scripture is committed to Bishops and Priests, lest peradventure it might be thought that such Authorities, Power, and Jurisdictions as Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Metropolitans now have, or heretofore at any time have had, justly and lawfully over other Bishops, were given them by God in Holy Scripture, (here is not one word of the Authority of a Bishop over a Presbyter, which they would shamefully fasten on the Reformers) we think it expedient*
 and

and necessary that all men should be advertised and taught that all such lawful Powers and Authorities of any one Bishop over another were and be given to them by the Consent, Ordinance, and positive Laws of men onely, and not by any Ordinance of God in Holy Scripture; and all other Power and Authority which any Bishop hath used or exercised over another (by which they plainly mean the Usurpations of the Bishop of Rome) which hath not been given him by such Consent and Ordinance of men, is in very deed no lawful Power, but plain Usurpation and Tyranny: (from whence the Reformers conclude) and therefore whereas the Bishop of Rome hath heretofore claimed and usurped, &c. But our Dissenters infer thus: From whence it is manifest, that according to them, *Diocesan Episcopacy* is of *Humane Right* onely, (i. e.) any one Bishop ruling over another Bishop or Presbyter, &c. What Paradox or Contradiction cannot these men prove at this rate? Or what could be done more to justify the Papists in using any ill arts of Equivocations, Falsifications, &c. without any regret of Conscience, so it may tend to the good of the Kirk? These are no *Piæ fraudes*, let Presbyterians or Jesuits use them never so oft.

Hence they go on, p. 5. to affirm, *That the power of Diocesan Bishops, as 'tis circa Sacra, though it may be called Ecclesiastical, yet if we consider its Origine and Source, we shall find it to be but Civil, seated primarily in the Civil Magistrate; that 'tis of humane make, and so far, but no farther lawful,*

F than

66 No PROTESTANT, but

than as sanctioned by the Laws of the Land; though I have mentioned many places in that book which assert the Divine Institution of Diocesan Bishops, and there be not a word in this Quotation to the contrary. But these men have not wit enough to conceal the mischievous ends which by these malicious lyes they seek to effect: for the Result is, *p. 5. The King, Lords, and Commons assembled in Parliament, can, as they see cause, make what alterations they please in the Episcopal or Diocesan Government; and the Parochial Episcopacy will not stand long, when that doth fall.* They might have inferred innocently enough, that the Magistrate might enlarge or narrow any Diocese, yea, pull down one, and erect another; they can adde to or take from the Episcopal Jurisdiction, but they cannot (at least according to the *Erudition of a Christian man*) destroy the Office of a Diocesan, or take away the Authority given them by Christ.

But the *Dissenters* have other considerations to prove their Assertions. If Episcopal Jurisdiction be of Divine Right, say they, it lieth not in the power of any Prince to alter it; but (say they) our Princes ever thought themselves to have been invested with a power of exempting any Presbyter from Episcopal Jurisdiction, *Ergo.* That our Princes judged themselves to have such a power of Exemptions, we are directed to consult Dr. *Burnet's History of the Reformation*, part 1. lib. 3. p. 103. where you will find the Complaint of the

the Roman Party beyond the Sea, (*i. e.*) of the Pope, concerning the Kings encroaching on the Jurisdiction of the Church, &c. To the which it was answered, *That the Division of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, whether of Patriarchs, Primates, Metropolitans, or Bishops, was according to the Roman Law regulated by the Emperors; of which the ancient Councils always approved: And in England, when the Bishoprick of Lincoln being judg'd of too great an extent, the Bishoprick of Ely was taken out of it, it was done onely by the King, with the consent of the Clergie and Nobles.* To this I answer, That the enlarging or streightning of the Episcopal Jurisdiction, as to its extent, is granted to be the Prerogative of Princes; but the exempting of whole Parishes, or of Monks and Friars from the Jurisdiction of the several Diocesans, was an Usurpation and Encroaching of the Pope upon the Right of Bishops: but *quo jure*, we shall hear from Dr. Burnet in due time, who tells us indeed, *That the Earl of Hartford had six good Prebendaries promised him, and the Lord Cromwel was made Dean of Wells; which though they had no cure of Souls, yet (saith Dr. Burnet) was there incumbent on them a sacred charge in the Cathedrals; and were just and necessary Encouragements for such as by age or other defects were not fit for a Parochial charge, and yet were otherwise capable of doing eminent service in the Church; or for the support of such as in their Parochial labours did serve so well as to merit Preferment, and yet were so mean-*

68 No PROTESTANT, but

ly provided for as to need some farther help for their subsistence. So that both the exemption of Monks, Friars, and others from the Episcopal Jurisdiction, was a Popish Encroachment: the bestowing of Ecclesiastical Dignities on Lay-persons was no better; for from the beginning it was not so, as the word Exemption implieth: for that supposeth some preceding Laws from which they were exempted. The Kings (saith Dr. Burnet) indowed great Churches for better ends; and had those Alienations been done by Law, it would have been of very bad consequence; but as it was done, was directly contrary to Magna Charta, and to the Kings Coronation Oath. Now let the Reader judge whether these Dissenters did well to quote Dr. Burnet as to the matter of fact, and to suppress and stifle what he said concerning the unlawfulness of it; which is sufficient to overthrow this inconsiderate Consideration of our Dissenters.

Another Argument of our Dissenters to prove that Episcopal Jurisdiction is not so much as of Ecclesiastical, but meer Civil Origine, is p. 6. which is also quoted out of Dr. Burnet's *History of Reformation*, part 1. lib. 3. p. 267. where they pretend it is said, That this great Prince (Hen. 8.) gave out such a Commission to Bonner, and it may be to others also, as makes it MOST MANIFEST that Diocesan Bishops were not of Gods, but onely of the Magistrates Institution. Hence (say they) Bonner in his Commission from the King most gratefully acknowledges that he received it onely from the Kings bounty,

bounty, and must deliver it up again when it should please his Majesty to call for it, even as Justices of the Peace, &c. whose Commission is *ad placitum*.

Now in this our *Dissenters* deal just as honestly as in their former Quotations : for Dr. Burnet hath printed the Commission at large ; which whoever can read, will find the clean contrary to be affirmed. Concerning these Commissions, Dr. Burnet says (which probably these men knew) *That by them it is clear that the Episcopal Function is acknowledged to be of divine appointment ; and that the person named by the King, was no otherwise than as Lay patrons present to Livings.* See p. 218. But this manner of appointing Bishops was not long in use ; it ended with *Harly* Bishop of *Hereford* : and the intent of it was, that they should execute their authority in the Kings name. But in Queen *Elizabeth's* time an Act of Parliament was past, for making of Bishops by the ancient way of *Conge d'eslire*, as it had been until the 25 of King *Henry* the Eighth, and not as in the latter end of his Reign, and in the days of *Edward* the Sixth. But as if these mens Opticks were extinguished when any light is offered them, they cannot see what their own Author writes concerning this, p. 218. *The Bishop* (by such Patents) *was onely legally authorized in such a part of the Kingdom to execute that Function which was to be derived to him by Imposition of Hands.* Therefore here was no pretence for denying that such persons were true Bishops (as both *Papists* and *Dissenters* have said)

70 NO PROTESTANT, but

and for saying as some have done, that they were not from Christ, but from the King. So the Doctor. But hear the Commission speak for it self, and then judge how most manifest it is, that *Diocesan Bishops* are onely of the Magistrates Institution, from this Commission; and I doubt not you will find it a most manifest Fiction,

The inscription of the Commission by which they say *Bonner* held his Bishoprick, shews of what nature it was, (*viz.*) *Licentia Regia concessa Domino Episcopo ad exercendam Jurisdictionem Episcopalem*, (i.e.) the Kings License granted to the Lord Bishop for the exercising of his Episcopal Jurisdiction. Which did no otherwise constitute him a Bishop, than a License to a Physician to practice, makes him a Physician. He was Bishop before: for so the King styles him, *Reverenda in Christo Patri, Edmundo Londonensi Episcopo*: but the designe was that he should own the authority of his Jurisdiction to be derived from the King, and not from the Pope, as is manifest in the first words of that Commission—*Quandoquidem omnis Jurisdicendi auctoritas atque etiam Jurisdictio Omnimodo, tam illa quæ Ecclesiastica dicitur, quam Secularis, à Regiâ potestate, velut à supremo capite, & omnium infra regnum nostrum Magistratum fonte & scaturigine, primitus emanavit, &c.* (i.e.) Whereas all Jurisdictione authority, as well that which is called Ecclesiastical as Secular, did originally flow from the Regal power, as from its supreme Head, and also of all Magistrates within

our Kingdom, 'as from its Fountain and Source' &c. This was the onely end of that Commission, to make void the dependance of the English Bishops on the See of Rome. The King meddled not with the Office of a Bishop, but the Accidents onely: which is plainly also exprest in the Commission; *Præter & ultra ea quæ tibi ex sacris literis Divinitus Commissa esse dignoscantur*, besides and beyond those things which are by Divine Institution committed unto thee in the Holy Scriptures. Now what can be more contrary to the Allegation of these *Dissenters*, than the Letter and Sence of this Commission, which they produce for it? for from these premises they as fallly as peremptorily conclude, p. 7. *Thus a Diocesan Episcopacy at best was judged but a humane Creature, owing to the Magistrate alone for its rise and conservation.* Behold the *Dissenters* Modesty!

Another proof these *Dissenters* offer (though it be but a repetition of what hath been already confuted) *Secondly* (say they) *this seems to be the sence of the Reformers in Edward the Sixth's time*; though they give no other evidence for it than what was done by Archbishop *Cramer* in *Henry the Eighth's* time, when if the Archbishop had any private Sentiments differing from the rest of the Reformers, he exploded them all by his subscription to the *Necessary Erudition*, as themselves observed; in which Opinion, as to this of the Episcopal Function, he continued to his death; acknowledging himself to be Archbishop

of *Canterbury*, as *Ridley* another Martyr did that he was Bishop of *London*, when they suffered under *Queen Mary*. To talk therefore of the progress made by Archbishop *Cranmer* in the days of *Edward* the Sixth, or how far he would have gone, because they produce nothing as to the point in hand, is but a dream of these *Dissenters*; and for such I let it pass, seeing they affirm, that what they insist on in this place about *Cranmer*, is taken out of *Dr. Burnet's History*, and a Record in him out of *Dr. Stillingfleet's Manuscript*, which hath been already considered.

A third Argument, p. 8. runs thus: *Such is the Prerogative of his Majesty in Ecclesiastical as well as Civil Affairs, that the asserting the Divine Right of Episcopacie is inconsistent with it.* But when these men had made a great flourish concerning the Kings Supremacy in Ecclesiastical Affairs (of which it will appear by their own practice, that they are not very tender) they are forced to acknowledge, p. 8. *That it is the sense of the Church of England, that Princes are ordained of God to govern Ecclesiastical as well as other persons; (and they might have added Causes too) and therefore if (say they) we consider such as are appointed by the King to govern under him circa Sacra, as the Officers of God fundamentally, and not formally, it may be granted.* What may be granted? The Answer ought to be thus exprest; *That those that are fundamentally the Officers of God, have not their dependance on the King for those Offices: this is their meaning,*

meaning, though they bring it in with a But But when we speak of the Officers of Christ in contradistinction to the Officers of the King, we mean such whose authority is from God, and remains good though the Prince should oppose it; as in the Case of the Primitive Officers of Divine Institution, who being forbidden to preach in Christs name, could reply, *Whether we shall obey God or man, judge ye?* Now let the Reader observe how careful these Dissenters are of the Kings Prerogative, how kind they are to themselves, and injurious to the Bishops, of whom they say, *Such as are Officers of the King, whether about the matters of the Lord, or about the King, (i. e.) whether Circa Sacra or Civil Affairs, 'tis in the power of the supreme Magistrate to give or take his Commission as it pleaseth him, yea, to direct to the number of such Officers, and to alter and change as the necessity of Affairs and the state of the National Constitution shall require. But then as for the Office of a Presbyter or Congregational Bishop (which is the name and thing they long for) this is so much of God, that what Right soever the Magistrate may have concerning Nomination, Election, or Presentation (which yet they will not grant, but contend that it belongs to the People) his prohibition cannot make void that Commission he hath received from Jesus Christ: They it seems may multiply to what number, and preach where and as often as they please. And if we change the term of a Diocesan Bishop (who they say is not of Divine Institution) into that of a Congregational Bishop,*

74 No PROTESTANT, but

shop, which they contend to be so; then all those evil consequences which they falsely suggest against the *Diocesans*, will fasten on the *Congregational Bishops*. Thus, p. 10, 11. *If Church-government (as Congregational) be of Divine Right, there can be no alteration of it; and consequently, Parochial or Congregational Bishops must not be touched: 'tis dangerous to come too neer that Mount. For which reason, how mischievous soever such Congregational Bishops may be in process of time to the Civil Government, the Civil, not the Ecclesiastical, must be altered, the State must submit to these Bishops: for the King, according to this Hypothesis, hath nothing to do with Church-affairs, which are wholly by the word of God confined to Church-men, among whose number the King cannot be justly mentioned, neither may the King take any Cognizance of what is done among them, nor may they hold their Courts in his, but onely in their own Name, or rather in Jesus Christs.* Whoever reads the History of the *Scotish Presbytery*, will find that their practice hath been agreeable to all these Positions of theirs; and the like hath been aimed at by our *Presbyteries* and *Dis-senters* at home. But it is a humour which predominates in these men,

Agnoscere nolunt, quod ignorare non possunt.

See Bishop *Spotwood's History*, and King *Charles* his large Declaration.

It is also well worth our observation, what they say,

say, p. 9. *There must be regard had to the present temper and state of the Kingdom in which the Church is, and a suiting the Ecclesiastical Affairs so far as they may have influence on the State, after such a manner as is most conducing to the more firm establishment of the fundamental Constitution, and consequent peace of the State: to which end the Civil Magistrate must still firmly adhere to that known Rule by which King Henry professed to walk; which is expressed in the Necessary Erudition, (viz.) The Scripture doth teach that all Christian people, as well as Priests and Bishops, should be obedient unto Princes and Potentates of the world. For the truth is, that God constituted and ordain'd the authority of Christian Kings and Princes to be the most high and supreme above all other Powers and Officers in this world in the regiment and government of their People, and committed to them, as unto the chief Heads of the Commonwealth, the Cure and Oversight of all the People which be in their Realms and Dominions, without any exceptions; and to them of right by Gods Command belongeth not onely to prohibit unlawful violence, to correct Offenders by corporal death or other punishment, to censure moral Honesty among their Subjects according to the Laws of their Realms, to defend Justice, and to procure the publick Weal and common Peace and Tranquility in outward and earthly things; but (NB) especially and principally to defend the Faith of Christ and his Religion, to conserve and maintain the true Doctrine of Christ, and all such as be true Preachers and Setters forth*

76 No PROTESTANT, but

forth thereof; and to abolish all Abuses, Heresies, and Idolatries, and to punish with corporeal pain such as of malice be the occasion of the same; and finally to oversee and cause that the said Bishops and Priests do execute their Pastoral Office truly and faithfully, and especially in those points which by Christ and his Apostles were given and committed to them: And in case they shall be negligent to execute the same, to cause them to redouble and supply their lack: and if they obstinately withstand their Princes kind monition, and will not mend their faults; then to put others in their room. And God hath also commanded the said Bishops and Priests to obey with all humbleness and reverence both Kings, and Princes, and Governours, and all their Laws, (N.B.) not being contrary to the Laws of God, whatsoever they be; and that not *propter iram*, but *propter Conscientiam*; (i. e.) not only for fear of punishment, but also for discharge of Conscience.

Now how cheerfully these Dissenters have yielded obedience to all such Laws of the Magistrates as are not contrary to the Laws of God, whatsoever they be, and that not *propter iram*, but *Conscientiam*, (i. e.) not for fear of punishment, but also for discharge of Conscience; their railing at the Laws as *tearing Engines*, and the Magistrates as *Persecuters*, and affronting them by constant *Conventicles*, and other dangerous *Meetings* and *Associations*, is too notorious. And such practices shew, that they are so far from obeying

beying for *Conscience*, that they condemn the Magistrates *Wrath*; as if God had given him the *Sword in vain*. And whether *Episcopacy* or *Presbytery* have been most agreeable to the Civil Government, we have had such a dreadful instance at home, as well as many terrible ones abroad, as may for ever affright the Nation from countenancing the like. It is yet fresh in memory, how many such *Congregations* as are now pleaded for, petitioned to bring the *Royal Martyr* to the Block, to make good the *Royal Maxime*, *No Bishop, no King*.

I cannot chuse but think how well these men would have complied with King *Harry's Rule*. He would certainly have found or made them much more obedient Subjects than they have been to *Charles*. the First, or Second: He would have reckoned with them for their *Old Mumpsumus*, as well as their *New Sumpsumus*; their murmurings against *Old Constitutions*, and their promoting of *New ones*: His *Cat with Six Tails* would have drawn more blood from such persons, than the most rigorous Laws of all the *Protestant-princes*, and all the Impositions since, which they call *Briars, and Thorns*, and tearing *Engines*; or the Subscription to the Thirty nine Articles, which they term *Forty Stripes save one*. That one Act *de Hæretico comburendo* lately repealed, and the hereticating Act of that Kings *Six Articles*, which *Cranmer* in vain opposed three days together in *Parliament*, and yet the

78 No PROTESTANT, but

the King got it to be confirmed, (which enacted to this effect following) might deserve the language they now give to the established Laws: but none durst be so bold.

1. *Whoever should deny that under the form of Bread and Wine there is not really the natural Body and Bloud of Christ conceived of the Virgin Mary ;*
2. *Or affirm that the Communion of the blessed Sacrament in both kinds is necessary for the Souls health ;*
3. *Or that any man might Marry after the Order of Priesthood received ;*
4. *Or that Women having vowed Chastity might marry ;*
5. *Or that private Masses were not lawful, and agreeable to the Word of God ;*
6. *Or that Auricular Confession was not necessary to be used in the Church of God, should suffer death, and forfeit Lands and Goods as a Felon. 31 H. 8. c. 14.*

I trust they would not have declaimed so publicly against that bloody Act, as they do now against the innocent and peaceable *Subscriptions* by Law required. They are the Laws, and in them the Law-givers, that are most under Persecution, being affronted by those Transgressors that act and write in defiance of them. The *Person of Quality* that wrote to his *Friend in the*
Coun-

Country, says of the Act for the Militia, *That it established a Standing Army by a Law, swearing us to a Military Government; That the Act for regulating Corporations, was for the keeping the wealthiest, worthiest, and soberest men out of the Magistracy of those places; That the Five-mile-Act was the imposing of a most unlawful and unjustifiable Oath; and the Act for Uniformity was fatal to our Church, in throwing out a very great number of worthy, learned, pious, and Orthodox Divines.* Though these Laws be no otherwise a persecution, than the order of a Physician or Friend, to keep down by strong might a distempered person that in a Phrensie hurts himself and those that watch for his good. *Non persequitur Medicus ægrum, sed æger Medicum.*

One thing I am somewhat better informed of by these men than I were; to wit, of what Religion these men are: They are not *Queen Elizabeths Protestants*, nor *Protestants of the established Church* under King James, or Charles the First, or Second; but *true Protestants according to the primitive Constitution of the Church of England in the days of King Henry; Henrician Protestants* (i.e. in some things *Papists*, and *Protestants* in some others:) And there have been many considerable points shewn, wherein they agree with the one as well as with the other. But this is a quality of all Male-contenters, to complain that *the former times were better than the present*; and the first Constitution in the days of King
Henry

80 No PROTESTANT, but

Henry the Eighth, and King Edward the Sixth, better than the establishment ever since Queen Elizabeth reigned.

But I would ask these men, Could they have conformed to *Episcopacy* and *Liturgie* under King *Henry the Eighth*, or *Edward the Sixth*, and can they not now? Was not *Episcopacy* the same then as it is now; and the *Liturgie* much better now than it was then? Could you conform to *Henry the Eighth's Primer*, to his *six Articles* and *seven Sacraments*? or to the *Liturgie* established by King *Edward the Sixth*, wherein were many things that were deservedly accounted *Ineptias*? As in the *Communion-office*, where they commend to the mercy of God *all his Servants departed hence from us*; And that God would command *our Prayers and Supplications by the ministry of his holy Adzels to be brought up into his holy Tabernacle*: The commending *Auricular* and *Secret Confession* to the Priest: And in the Office of *Baptism*, enjoyning a great part of that Office to be performed *the people standing at the Church-door*; and then to *take the child by the right-hand*, and *lead it towards the Font*: To *signe it with the signe of the Cross on the Breast*, as well as the *Forehead*. The use of *Exorcism*, in these words: *I command thee, thou unclean Spirit, in the Name of the Father, &c. to come out and depart from this Infant*. The dipping the child three times in the Water, (except in case of weakness) *first on the right-side, then on the left, and then with the Face towards*

wards the Water. Then to put on it the *Cryſom*, ſaying, *Take thou this white Veſture for a Token of the Innocency, &c.* Then to anoint the Infant on the head, praying God to anoint him with the *Unction of the Spirit*. And (to omit many other things) anointing the ſick, and ſigning his breaſt with the ſigne of the Croſs. Commending at the time of burial into the hands of Gods mercie the Souls of the departed.

As for the Book of *conſecrating Biſhops, Priests, and Deacons*, it was added to the *Liturgie* by King *Edward*, as it is received now, with ſome few alterations (mentioned by *Dr. Burnet*) for the better, p. 144.

His *Articles*, and *Acts for Uniformity*, were as ſevere as any that are now. And all theſe were eſtabliſhed in *Archbiſhop Cranmer's* time, and with his good approbation. So that it is an unparalleled piece of confidence to aſſert, as theſe *Differers* do, p. 7. concerning the firſt Opinions of *Archbiſhop Cranmer*, (viz.) *That Biſhops and Priests were at one time, and were no two things, but both one Office*; and that in the New Teſtament, *He that is appointed to be a Biſhop or Priest, needeth no Conſecration by the SS. for election or appointment thereto is ſufficient. That they cannot underſtand that he did, at any time vary from thoſe Opinions in the leaſt; and that in the Neceſſary Erudition, which he ſubſcribed, there is nothing aſſerted but what is conſiſtent with, or an approbation of what was the Archbiſhop's Opinion about theſe points, is*

82 No PROTESTANT, but

an egregious, gross, and scandalous Fiction. But to go on :

In the Articles of Religion, printed 1552. to root out the Discord of Opinion, &c. there is *one of the Traditions of the Church*, which says, *Whoever through his private judgment willingly and purposely doth openly break the Traditions and Ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common Authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that other may fear to do the like) as one that offendeth against the common Order of the Church, and hurteth the Authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the Consciences of weak Brethren.* And in another Article concerning the Liturgy; it is thus declared : *The Book (of Prayers) which of very late time was given to the Church of England by Authority of Parliament, containing the Manner and Form of praying, and ministring the Sacraments; and the Book of ordering Ministers of the Church, set forth by the foresaid Authority, are godly, and in no point repugnant to the wholesome Doctrine of the Gospel, but agreeing thereunto, furthering and beautifying the same not a little; and therefore of all faithful Ministers of the Church of England, and chiefly of the Ministers of the Lord, ought to be received and allowed with all readiness of mind and thanksgiving, and to be commended to the People of God.* Besides, the Discourse concerning Ceremonies retained in our Book, was then set forth; as also a Proclamation against those that innovate, alter, or leave down any

Rite

Rite or Ceremony in the Church, and that preach without License; printed in the second year of *Edward the Sixth*, (to which the Form for *Bidding of Prayers* may be added.) See p. 128. of *Dr. Burnet's* second part. All which notwithstanding, *Bucer* and *Peter Martyr* approved of Conformity.

And *Mr. Calvin* himself both perswaded and approved all that was done in the second Liturgy of *King Edward*, in an Epistle of his to the then *Protector*, being the forty first Epistle in the Edition at *Amsterdam*, 1667. to this effect: *Let there be published a Summary of Doctrine to be received by all, which all may conform to in their preaching; for the observance of which, let all Bishops and Parish-Priests be obliged by Oath; and let none be admitted to Ecclesiastical Function, unless he promise to observe that consent of Doctrine inviolate: let there be also a common form of Catechism for the use of Children: I also greatly approve that there be a certain Form of Prayers and Ecclesiastical Rites from which it should not be lawful for the Pastors to recede in their Function; as well to provide for the simplicity and unskilfulness of some, as also that thereby the consent of all the Churches may more certainly appear; and lastly, that the desultory levity of some men, who affect Novelties, may be prevented. So that there ought to be an established Catechism, an established Administration of the Sacraments, and publick Form of Prayers.*

Now I would ask our Dissenters, whether if

84 No PROTESTANT, but

they had lived in *those days*, they would have conformed to that *Episcopacie, Liturgie, and Ceremonies* which were then established, or not? If they would not, why do they so cry up that *Episcopacie* and *Reformation* which was then established, accusing the present Church of degenerating from it? Why do they applaud *Cranmer*, who died Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and *Ridley* Bishop of *London*, and those that joyned in that *Reformation*, as *blessed Martyrs* and *Confessors*; and abominate our present Bishops as *Thorns* and *Thistles*, the *Military Instruments of the Devil*, and condemn them for *intolerable Impositions*? Would not their *Nonconformity* then, have cast a great Reproach both on those Bishops, their persons, actions, and sufferings, as if they had been (as they say ours are now) *Antichristian Bishops, Persecutors, and Tyrants*? Or if they would have conformed then, why do they not do so now, when our Bishops are in *Office* the very same; and the *Liturgy*, and conditions of *Communion* as to that, are much more easie, by reason of many Amendments (as they confess.) The late Acts of Parliament required of Ministers to capacitate them for their Function, are such as (they say) *they cannot without sin submit unto*: but what is that to a *Lay-conformity*, to which none of those things are required? Why do they amuse the People with many heinous sins in our Conformity, and keep them still in a state of *Schism*, and like those, *Mat. 23. 13. will neither enter into a*
Com-

Communion with us *themselves*, nor suffer those that would to enter? And do not this Triumvirate witness against *themselves*, as those there did, that (notwithstanding their *building the Tombs of those Prophets*, and *garnishing the Sepulchres of those righteous persons*, and bewailing their undeserved sufferings) by their irreconcilable hatred to their lawful and religious Successours, they are far from being *the Disciples of those holy men*? Did not Dr. Taylor, a learned Martyr, declare of the Liturgy as it stood in Edward the Sixth's days, that according to the Rules of our Christian Religion in every behalf, *no Christian Conscience could be offended with any thing therein contained*? and is it well done to fill the Consciences of the People now with Scruples against almost every part of it? How these men would have demeaned themselves under the Impositions and Bishops in the days of Henry the Eighth, and Edward the Sixth, I cannot divine, Uniformity being as strictly enjoined then, as it is now. For such as did officiate in any other manner than was prescribed by the Liturgie, were for the first offence to suffer six months imprisonment; for the second, to be imprisoned during life: and if any should print in defamation of it, or threaten Clergie-men for using of it, he was to be fined 10 l. for the first offence, 20 l. for the second, and for the third to forfeit all his Goods, and suffer imprisonment during life.

And as for the Reign of Queen Mary, let the Book of Martyrs be viewed, and it will appear that

86 No PROTESTANT, but

they who bore Testimony to the Truths of Christ, and truly deserved the name of *Martyrdom*, were such as were eminent Assertors of the *established Episcopacy* and *Liturgie*; such as *Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, Tayler*. Nor can there be a greater Reproach to the Sufferings of those men, than to bring into the Catalogue of *Martyrs* with them, such as suffered either in the days of King *Edward* or Queen *Mary*, for denying the Deity or Humanity of Christ, the Doctrine of the Trinity, &c.

And as probably they would not have conformed under King *Edward*, so it appears they did not under Queen *Elizabeth*. The happy Government of this incomparable Princess is defamed, even for that which would have been highly commended in others. Her moderation, and respect to the salvation of all *Dissenters*, by enlarging the terms of Communion; see what the *Dissenters* say, p. 64. of the *Reply: The great propension in Queen Elizabeth's days to gain over the Popish Party to her Communion by those alterations made in the Liturgie in favour of the Papists, the ordering the Sacramental Bread to be made round in the fashion of the Wafers used in the time of Queen Mary, the requiring the Table to be placed where the Altar stood, &c. was attended with the conformity of many who were cordially affected to the interest of the Church of Rome.* So far the *Dissenters*: But it is well known, that within the first ten years of her Majesties Reign, in which this Latitude was granted,

granted, the Constitution of the Nation was so altered, that whereas in Queen Mary's Reign they were generally Papists, many of them were by these moderate proceedings become real Protestants. And the very truth is, her Indulgence wrought better effects on that sort of *Recusants*, than on some others, over whom she was forced by their obstinate behaviour to carry a strict hand, and to joyn them in the same Acts of Parliament for retaining her Majesties Subjects in due Obedience, which are yet in force. And hence it is we have such severe Reflections on her Person and Government. Though the World could not shew a better Prince, or more equal Administrations in the Government of Church or State, yet spare they not to revile her at this instant, and complain that *she carried not on the Reformation in some respects so far as King Edward had done*; and great endeavours are uled to have her Acts of Parliament rescinded. Queen Elizabeth (say the *Dissenters*, p. 63. of Reply, as Dr. Burnet most admirably expresseth it) *though she had been bred up from her infancy with a hatred to the Papacie, and a love to the Reformation; yet as her first impressions of her Father's Reign were in favour of such old Rites as he had still retained: so in her nature she loved State, and some magnificence in Religion, as well as in every thing else. She thought that in her Brothers Reign they had stript it too much of external Ornaments, and had made their Doctrine too narrow in some points: therefore she intended*

88 No PROTESTANT, but

tended to have some things explained in more general terms, that so all Parties might be comprehended by them: She inclined to keep up Images in the Churches, and to have the manner of Christs presence in the Sacrament left in some general words, that those who believe a corporal presence, might not be driven away from the Church by too nice an explanation of it. History of Reformation, part. 2. lib. 3.

Answ. First, as for Images, she onely forbad the removing of them in a tumultuary way, which might cause many inconveniencies: but as soon as she was settled, it is known that by her *Injunctions* she caused all Images to be removed out of the Churches: Then for the points of Doctrine, they are as they were then; and as to her continuing the Church in its splendour, was there not a cause? Dr. Burrel gives a good one. Some of the *Queen's Courtiers* had an eye to the fair *Manners* of the great Sees: and being men of ill tempers, and lives; and probably of no Religion, would have persuaded the Queen that nothing could unite all the Reformed Churches so effectually, as to bring the English Church to the Model beyond the Seas; and that it would much enrich the Crown, if she took the Revenues of the Bishops and Cathedrals into her own hands. This made those on the other hand who layed to heart the true interest of the Protestant Religion, and therefore endeavoured to preserve the Church in that strong and well-modelled frame to which it was brought; particularly the Lord Burleigh,

leigh, the wisest Statesman of that Age, and perhaps of any other, study how to engage the Queen out of interest to support it : They demonstrated to her, that these new Models would certainly bring with them a great abatement of her Majesties Prerogative, since if the concerns of Religion came into popular hands, there would be a power set up distinct from hers, over which she could have no authority. Et hinc illæ lachrymæ.

The great designe of the Queen and her Council being to unite the Nation in one Faith, they thought fit to remit the rigour of some Laws, and to omit that passage in the Litany of *Edward the sixth, From the Tyranny of the Church of Rome and her detestable Enormities*. And whereas in King *Henry's* time to deny the taking of the Oath of *Supremacy*, which might be then offered to all, was made Treason and a *Premunire* ; the Oath was made more facile for a time, by omitting the Title of *Supreme Head* ; and the punishment was onely loss of Goods, for those that denied it ; and no man to be in any publick Employment that refused it. But it was not then generally imposed on all.

And the reason for omitting the *Rubrick* concerning *kneeling at the Communion*, was, as Dr. Burnet says, p. 392. *That they might not seem to exclude the belief of the corporal presence, which a great part of the Nation then believed*. And whereas the words at the delivery of the Elements in King *Edward the sixth's* first Liturgy, (*viz.*) *The Body and*
Bloud

90 No PROTESTANT, but

Bloud of Iesus Christ preserve thy Body and Soul, &c. were left out in the second Liturgy, as too much favouring the Corporal presence; instead whereof these words onely were used, *Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee*: They now joyned both those together in *Queen Elizabeth's Liturgy*. And I never yet heard of any Objection against it.

And by this moderation, the Heads of the Romish Faction yielding Conformity, (though they did it feignedly, yet) great numbers of the people did truly and constantly conform, and lived in due obedience to her Majesty: whereby the publick Peace was preserved, which had been frequently disturbed by divers Insurrections and Rebelions in the days of King *Henry* her Father, and her Brother King *Edward* the sixth; and the true Religion preserved, as by Gods mercy we now enjoy it. The excellent grounds of that *Queen's* moderation, are described in what followeth, as also the good effects of it.

Queen Elizabeth in her Instructions to Sir *Francis Walsingham*, Aug. 11. 1570. affirms, That the Heads of the Romish Party did ordinarily resort from the beginning of her Reign in all open places to the Churches, and to Divine Service in the Church, without contradiction, or shew of misliking. Which was during the first ten years of her Reign, as Sir *Edward Cooke* declared in his Charge at *Norwich-Assize*, 1605. And our Dissenters acknowledge, p. 64. of the Reply, That the great Propension in
Queen

Queen Elizabeth's days to gain over the Papish Party to her Communion by those alterations made in the Liturgie, the ordering the Sacramental Bread to be made round in fashion of a Wafer used in the time of Queen Mary, the requiring the Table to be placed where the Altar stood, &c. was attended with the Conformity of many who were cordially addicted to the interest of the Church of Rome. But great multitudes became real Protestants, to the admiration and astonishment of the Papists.

Sir Francis Walsingham's Letter concerning the Queen's proceeding against both Papists and Puritans, may give all sober persons satisfaction: for thus he writes:

I find her Majesties Proceedings to be grounded upon two Principles: The one, That Consciences are not to be forced, but to be won and reduced by force of Truth, with aid of Time, and use of all good Means of Instruction and Perswasions: The other, That causes of Conscience, when they exceed their bounds, and grow to be matter of Factions, lose their nature; and that Sovereign Princes ought distinctly to punish their Practices and Contempt, though colour'd with the pretence of Conscience
and

and Religion. According to these Principles, her Majesty at her coming to the Crown utterly disliking the Tyranny of Rome, proceeded against the Papists, &c. And for the other Party, which have been offensive to the Estate, though in another degree, which named themselves Reformers, and be commonly called Puritans, this hath been the proceeding toward them a great while. When they inveighed against such abuses in the Church as Pluralities, Nonresidence, and the like; their Zeal was not condemned, onely their Violence was sometime censured: when they refused the use of some Ceremonies and Rites as superstitious, they were tolerated, with much connivency and gentleness; yea, when they called in question the Superiority of Bishops, and pretended to a Democracy in the Church, yet their Propositions were here considered, and by contrary Writings debated and discoursed: Yet all this while it was perceived that their course was dangerous, and very popular. As, because Papistry was odious theretofore, it was e-
ver

ver in their mouths that they sought to purge the Church from the Reliques of Papistry; a thing acceptable to the People, who love ever to run from one Extream to another. . Because multitudes of Rogues and Poverty was an Eye-sore and a dislike to every man, therefore they put into the Peoples heads, That if Discipline were planted, there should be no Vagabonds nor Beggars: a thing very plausible. And in like manner, they promised the People many of the impossible Wonders of their Discipline; besides, they opened to the People a way to Government by their Consistory and Presbytery; a thing though in consequence no less prejudicial to the Liberties of Private men, than to the Sovereignty of Princes, yet in first shew very popular: Nevertheless this, except it were in some few that entred into extream Contempt, was born with, because they pretended in dutiful manner to make Propositions, and to leave it to the Providence of God and the Authority of the Magistrate. But now of late years, when there issued from them that affirmed

X
 firmed the consent of the Magistrate was not to be attended ; when under a pretence of a Confession, to avoid slander and imputations, they combined themselves by Clafses and Subscriptions ; when they descended into vile and base means of defacing the Government of the Church by ridiculous Pasquils ; when they begun to make many Subjects in doubt to take Oaths, which is one of the fundamental parts of Justice in this Land, and in all places ; when they began both to vaunt of their strength, and number of their Partisans and followers, and to use Comminations that their Cause would prevail through Uproar and Violence : Then it appeared to be no more Zeal, no more Conscience, but meer Faction and Division ; and therefore though the State were compelled to hold somewhat a harder hand to restrain them than before, yet was it with as great moderation as the peace of the State or Church could permit. And therefore, Sir, to conclude, consider uprightly of these matters, and you shall see her Majesty is no more a Temporizer

riзер in Religion : it is not success abroad, nor the change of Servants at home, can alter her ; onely as the things themselves alter, she applied her religious Wisdom to Methods correspondent to them ; still retaining the two Rules before-mentioned, in dealing tenderly with Conscience, and yet in discovering Faction from Conscience, and Softness from Singularity.

FAREWEL.

E. W.

And it was the insolence of this Party, that necessitated the severity of the Laws to be executed on them : for besides their deserting the Publick Worship, and framing *Assemblies* and *Presbyteries*, writing against the *Liturgie* and *Bishops* in very scurrilous Language, more like *Scullions* than *Scholars*, as *Cumden* observes ; she passed those Acts of the 23 and 35 of her Reign ; which causeth their Stomachs thus to rise against her ever since. She also set forth a Proclamation against such *Scriblers* as these Authors are ; which, for the usefulness of it at this season, I have thought worth my labour to transcribe.

By

By the Queen.

*A Proclamation against certain Seditious
and Schismatical Books and Libels,
&c.*

THAT *Our* Queens most Excellent Majesty,
considering how within these few years
past, and now of late, certain seditious and
evil-disposed persons towards her Majesty,
and the Government established for causes
Ecclesiastical within her Majesties Domini-
ons, have devised, written, printed, or caused
to be seditiously and secretly published and dis-
persed, sundry schismatical and seditious
Books, diffamatory Libels, and other phana-
tical Writings amongst her Majesties Sub-
jects, containing in them Doctrine very erro-
neous, and other matters notoriously untrue,
and dangerous to the State, and against the
godly reformation of Religion and Govern-
ment Ecclesiastical established by Law, and so
quietly of long time continued, and also a-
gainst the persons of Bishops, and others
placed in authority Ecclesiastical under her
high

Hignness by her authority, in railing sort, and beyond the bounds of all good humanity: All which Books, Libels, and Writings, tend by their scope to perswade and bring in a monstrous and apparant dangerous Innovation within her Dominions and Countries, of all manner of Ecclesiastical Government now in use, and to the abridging, or rather to the overthrow of her Highness lawful Prerogative, allowed by Gods Law, and established by the Laws of the Realm, and consequently to reverse, dissolve, and set at liberty the present Government of the Church, and to make a dangerous change of the form of Doctrine, and use of Divine Service of God, and the Ministration of the Sacraments now also in use, with a rash and malicious purpose also to dissolve the Estate of the Prelacy, being one of the three ancient Estates of this Realm under her Highness, whereof her Majesty willeth to have such a reverend regard, as to their places in the Church and Commonwealth appertaineth. All which said lewd and seditious practices, do directly tend to the manifest wilful breach of great number of good Laws and Statutes of this Realm, inconveniencies nothing regarded by such Innovations.

In consideration whereof, her Highness graciously minding to provide some good and speedy Remedy to withstand such notable, dangerous, and ungodly Attempts, and for that purpose to have such enormous Malefactors discovered and condignly punished, doth signify this her Highness mistaking and indignation of such dangerous and wicked Enterprises; and for that purpose doth hereby will and also straightly charge and command, that all persons whatsoever, within any her Majesties Realms and Dominions, who have or hereafter shall have any of the said seditious Books, Pamphlets, Libels, or Writings, or any of like nature already published, or hereafter to be published, in his or their custody, containing such matters as above are mentioned, against the present Order & Government of the Church of England, or the lawful Ministers thereof, or against the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church, & allowed by the Laws of the Realm: That they & every of them do presently after, with convenient speed, bring in, and deliver up the same unto the Ordinary of the Diocese, or of the place where they inhabit, to the intent they may be utterly detested by the said Ordinary, or otherwise used by them. And

that from henceforth no person or persons whatsoever be so hardy as to write, contrive, print, or cause to be published or distributed, or to keep any of the same, or any other Books, Libels, or Writings of like nature and quality, contrary to the true meaning and intent of this her Majesties Proclamation. And likewise, that no man hereafter give any instruction, direction, favour, or assistance to the contriving, writing, printing, publishing, or dispersing of the same, or such like Books, Libels, or Writings whatsoever, as they tender her Majesties good favour, will avoid her high displeasure, and as they will answer the contrary at their uttermost perils: and upon such pains and penalties, as by the Law any way may be inflicted upon the offenders, in any of these behalfs, as persons maintaining such seditious actions, which her Majesty intendeth to have severely executed. And if any person have had knowledge of the Authors, Writers, Printers, or Dispersers thereof, which shall within one month after the publication hereof, discover the same to the Ordinary of the place where he had such knowledge, or to any of her Majesties Privy Council: the same person shall not for his former concealment be

100 No PROTESTANT, but
hereafter molested or troubled. Given at her
Majesties Palace at Westminster, the thirteenth
of February, 1588. In the One and thirtieth
year of her Highnesss Reign.

God Save the Queen.

Imprinted at London by the Deputies of Christo-
pher Barker, Printer to the Queens most Ex-
cellent Majesty. 1588.

The Reader may see more, p. 64. of Dr. Burnes
second part. What Innocence or Moderation of
the living, can secure them from the Reproaches
of such *Dissenters*, who thus slander the best of
Princes, to whom we owe the Establishment of
our Religion? Whoever considers how deeply
the Nation was involved in Popery, what Rebel-
lions had been raised on occasion of the Reforma-
tion in the days of King *Henry the Eighth*, and
Edward the Sixth, how much time as well as great
art it required to satisfy the People, and procure
such a Parliament as might settle Religion, and
how peaceably all these difficulties were over-
come; must acknowledge that she wrought
wonders for the Truth, as God also did for her
preservation. She lived long in hazard of her
life for the Gospels sake, and was like to see no
other Crown but that of *Martyrdom*. She learned

Mode-

the DISSENTERS Plot. 101

Moderation from the things she suffered, and shewed as much mercy to the Souls and Consciences, as well as Bodies of her greatest Enemies. She took away onely whatever might hinder them from embracing the Truth, and against many strong Temptations preserved the Church in Holiness and Beauty too. She enjoyned her first Parliament to consider of Religion without heat or partial affection, or using any reproachful terms of Papist or Heretick, to avoid the extreams of Idolatry and Superstition on one hand, and Contempt and Irreligion on the other: yet these ill-natured men represent her great Vertues as Vices.

From the days of Queen Elizabeth this Church hath continued (these are Dr. Burnet's words) to be the Sanctuary of all Forreigners, and the chief Object of the Envy and Hatred of the Popish Church, and the great Glory of the Reformation; and hath wisely avoided the splitting asunder on the high points of the Divine Decrees, which have broken so many of the Reformed beyond Sea; but in these hath left Divines to the freedom of their several Opinions: Nor did she run on that Rock of defining at first so peremptorily the manner of Christs preience in the Sacrament, which divided the German and Helvetian Churches; but in that did also leave a latitude to men of different Perswasions. From this great temper, it might have been reasonably expected that we should have continued united at home; and then for things Sacred as well as Civil, we had been out

102 No PROTESTANT, but

of danger of what all our Forreign Enemies could have contrived or done against us. But the Enemy while the Watchmen slept sowed his Tares, of which, because (as he says) he ends his History at the time when these Differences first arose, and because in his search the Doctor discovered some things of great importance which give a clearer light into the beginnings of those Differences, he professeth to give this impartial account: Preface to the second Volume. There were many learned and pious Divines in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, who being driven beyond the Seas, had observed the new Models in Geneva and other places for the censuring of scandalous persons, of mixed Judicatories of Ministers and Laity: These reflecting on the great looseness of life complained of in King Edward's days, thought such a Platform might be effectual to keep out the like disorders. There were also some few Rites reserved in the Church, that had been either used in the Primitive Church; or though brought in of later times, yet seemed of excellent use to bring Reverence in holy performances; which had also this to be said for them, That the keeping of them was in imitation of what Christ and his Apostles did in symbolizing with the Jewish Rites, thereby to gain the Jews; and it was necessary, by reserving these, to let the world see, that though corruptions were thrown out, yet the Reformers did not love to change onely for changes sake, when it was not otherwise needful. And thus they hoped would draw in many, who otherwise would not so easily have forsaken the

Roman

Roman Communion. The Doctor adds, *Yet these Divines excepted to those, as compliances with Popery; and though they professed no great dislike to the Ceremonies themselves, or doubted of their lawfulness, yet were they against their continuance, on this single account, which was indeed the chief reason why they were continued: but all this Debate was modestly handled, without heat or separation. Afterward some of the Courtiers had an eye to the fair Mannors of the greatest Sees; and being men of ill tempers and lives, and probably of no Religion, would have perswaded the Queen that nothing could so unite the Reformed Churches, as to bring the English Church to the Model beyond Sea: and that it would much enrich the Crown, if she took the Revenues of Bishopricks and Cathedrals into her hands. This made those who laid to heart the true interest of the Protestant Religion, and therefore endeavoured to preserve the Church in that strong and well-modelled frame to which it was brought (particularly the Lord Burleigh, the wisest Statesman of that Age, and perhaps of any other) study how to engage the Queen out of interest to support it. And they demonstrated to her, that those new Models would certainly bring with them a great abatement of her Prerogative, since if the concerns of Religion came into popular hands, there would be a power set up distinct from hers, over which she could have no authority. This she perceived well, and therefore resolved to maintain the ancient government of the Church. But by this means it became a matter of interest;*

104 NO PROTESTANT, but

and so those differences which might have been more easily reconciled before, grew into formed Factions. And it becoming the interest of some, to put it past reconciling, this was too easily effected. Those of the Division finding they could not carry their main design, raised all the Clamours they could against the Church-men; and put in Bills into the Parliament against Pluralities, Nonresidences, and the Excesses of Spiritual Courts. But the Queen being possess'd with this, that the Parliaments meddling in these matters tended to the lessning of her Authority, of which she was extremely sensible, got these Bills to be thrown out. If the abuses that gave such occasion to the Malecontented to complain had been redressed, they would have had little to work on: but these things furnished them with new complaints still. The Market-Towns also being ill provided for, voluntary Contributions were made for Lectures: in those places the Lecturers were generally men that overtopped the Incumbents in diligent and zealous preaching; and depending on the people for Subsistence, were engaged to follow the humours of those who commanded the voluntary Contributions. All these things tended to the increase of the Party, which owed its chief growth to the scandalous maintenance of the Ministers of great Towns, for which reason they were seldom of great abilities; and to the scandals given by Pluralities and Nonresidences of others that were over-provided. Yet the Government in Civil matters was so steady all the Queens Reign, that they could do no great things after she

once

once declared her self so openly and resolutely against them (N.B.)

Her strict enjoying Uniformity, making some turbulent persons Examples, countenancing the Clergie, especially the Archbishop Whitgift, who wrote excellently in defence of our Church against the Objections of T. C. and the sincerity and watchfulness of the Council and inferiour Officers, preserved the Nation in peace all her days. If her Successours had held the Reins of Government with the like steadiness of hand, the Nation (how headstrong soever) could never have run into those desperate Confusions, from which nothing but the hand of God could have redeemed us.

How the Dissenters behaved themselves in the days of her peaceable Successour King James, is manifest from the Character which he gave of them after long experience, in both his Kingdoms of Scotland and England. They conceived great hopes of his favour from his Education in Scotland; and in the first year of his Reign over England, they framed a Petition in the name of a thousand Ministers for Reformation; which was answered first by the University of Oxford, and secondly by that of Cambridge. But the King told his Parliament, March 19. 1603. *The third, which I call a Sect rather than Religion, is the Puritan and Novelist, who do not differ from us in points of Religion, as in their confused forms of Polity and Purity, being ever discontented with the present Government, and impatient to suffer any Superiority; which*

106 No PROTESTANT, but

which makes their Sect unable to be suffered in any well-governed Commonwealth; And in his Βασιλικὴ Δίεξις, These rash-headed Preachers (saith he) think it their honour to contend with Kings, and perturb whole Kingdoms, P. 41, 42. Take heed, my Son, to such Puritans, very Pests in the Church and Commonwealth, whom no desert can oblige, neither Oaths nor Promises bind, breathing nothing but Seditious and Calumnies; aspiring without Measure, railing without Reason, and making their own Imaginations, without any warrant in the Word, the Square of their Consciences. I protest before the great God, and since I am here upon my Testament, it is no place for me to lye in, that you shall never find with any Highland or Border-thieves greater ingratitude, and more lyes and vile perjuries, than with these Phana-tick Spirits. And suffer not the Principles of them to brook your Land, if you like to sit at rest, except you would keep them for trying your patience, as Socrates did an evil Wife. He gave them a fair hearing at Hampton-Court, and finding their Arguments as weak as their Malice was strong, partly by his Reason, and partly by his Authority, and the execution of the good Laws made by his Predecessors, kept them in subjection, though not without much striving all his days. But what they could not effect by open force in his Reign, they bring to pass in the days of King Charles the First, by procuring through their specious Pretences, and his Majesties gracious Conde-scensions, such a shew of Authority to head them,

as animated them to an Open Rebellion, which ended in the utter ruine of King, Church, and State. And such a *Head* it is, that with all Art and Industry the present *Dissenters* do unanimously contend for, to the *many hands already provided*. But if it shall please God to suffer us to run into the like Confusions a second time, after that we have had such sad experience of such deceitful men, and the methods whereby we were formerly insnared, I know not to what I may impute it, but to the righteous judgment of God for our great ingratitude and unfruitfulness under the manifold mercies, as well Temporal as Spiritual, which may justly cause him to give us up to a Spiritual infatuation, that we should not know or do in this our day *the things that belong to our peace*; as *Livy* observed of old *Urgentibus Rempubicam fati dei & hominum salutare admonitiones spernuntur*.

But I fear I have displeased the *Prefacers* by this Digression: for p. 11. they tell us, *They presume that by this time what they undertook appears with some conviction to the Reader*, 1. That a Parochial or Congregational Church-Government is according to the Church of England, *Jure Divino*. 2. That the Diocesan or National Government is *Jure Humano*; And for its particular form, must be such in all Ages as our Civil Governours judge most meet, as a means for preservation of Parochial Discipline (in the first place) and therefore the great end of the Civil Constitution.

Though

Though these men can never persuade themselves that they have proved from the Evidences produced, either that Diocesan Episcopacy was in the sense of our Reformers onely *Jure Humano*, and not so much as Ecclesiastical, but meerly Civil; nor that Parochial and Congregational or gathered Churches (which in a strict notion, and as the *Dissenters* have formerly disputed about them, are very diverse things) are *Jure Divino*; yet I doubt not but there are such *Ignoramus*'s and prejudiced persons as will *jurare in verba Magistri*, and acquit the *Dissenters* of any Plot against the established Ecclesiastical Government, and believe all those falshoods alleadged by them from the abused Evidences of the *Necessary Erudition* and Dr. *Burnet*; though the forgery be much like that which I have heard of one that wrote a dead mans Will, and putting it into his mouth drew it out again, and swore that he had the very words from the mouth of the party deceased. And yet from this very Dunghil, you may hear them crowing *Victoria*: and yet modestly, as they think, do they demand; p. 11. *That this Fiction of theirs be declared to be the true Church-of-England-principle, and to be according to the present Sentiments of our Governours, for the relief of tender Consciences; and that the Congregational or Parochial Church-discipline be established by Law, it being so consistent with the ancient Constitution of the Government of this Realm.* Thirdly, p. 13. *The abolishing the present Laws about Conformity, and*
ignori *esta-*

establishing new ones for defence of the Parochial or Congregational Church-Discipline. P. 15. Let all such particular Congregational or Parochial Churches as are of Divine Institution according to the sense of the old and most true Church of England, be by Act of Parliament declared to be so, and taken under the protection of the Laws, and the Dissenters are satisfied. And p. 17. they complain that they are misrepresented as Enemies both to Church and State, for adhering to old Protestant Principles about Church-Discipline, as if that were an overt act of a Spirit seditious and phanatical; and they humbly apprehend (p. 15.) this to be enough to evince that the Dissenters are not such Enemies to Union as some have asserted, nor are they for destroying a National Church-government; they are onely against unaccountable Innovations, even such as tend to the ruine of the old Protestant National Church. And yet Mr. Humfries hath, with their approbation, printed a Half-sheet to prove them guilty of the Contrary, as you shall find hereafter.

The next Paradox undertaken by our Prefacer, is to shew That this Model would fix the desired firm and lasting Union among all sorts of Protestants, p. 11. And among the sorts of Protestants he mentioneth, p. 15. as Sound Protestants, not onely Episcopal and Presbyterian, or Congregational, but meer Anabaptists: these are all Sound Protestants. But it seems there are other sorts which may be comprehended in this Union, though

110 No PROTESTANT, but

though not so sound, or somewhat more than *meer Anabaptists* (though the denial of a Sacramental Institution, such as Mr. Baxter produceth clear Scripture-proof for, be no good signe of *Sound Protestantism*; nor was it accounted less than Schism or Heresie among the Antients:) for under the notion of *meer Anabaptists*, some Congregations of the *Munster*-perswasion may set up, who are professed Enemies both to Magistracy and Ministry; and many of our English have professed the same Opinions; and though they had not a *John of Leydon* to set up as King of their *New Jerusalem*, yet we know what manner of King they threw down, and what they would have set up in his room, by their frequent *Petitions*, and other Endeavours. And how they can keep out *Quakers*, and some other Sects as *Sound Protestants* as these, is hard to divine.

But to fix this *lasting Union* among these *Congregational Bishops*, p. 11. Each of them must have (by Law) full power for administering all Ordinances, and exercising Discipline over those who freely submit themselves, (i.e.) to such Pastors as they shall chuse: An excellent Expedient for Union, and to advance the *Kings Prerogative*! But let us have patience to hear their proofs. The first is, p. 11. That lesser differences notwithstanding, they may be considered as united to one another, in that they profess the same Faith, preach the same Word, and administer the same Sacraments. And can the Prefater assure us that all will do so? We have

the DISSENTERS Plot. 111

have found them preaching and printing against each other, and whole Volumes have been written to prove each other *Schismatics, Hereticks, and Limbs of Antichrist*. And though they should agree in all these, there may be dangerous *Schisms and Differences* notwithstanding; for so the *Presbyterians* profess to agree with the *Episcopal-men*, and yet hate them perfectly: And the *Donatists* embraced the same Faith and Sacraments, and retained the Order of Bishops too: *Pares Credimus, & uno sigillo signati sumus; nec aliter baptizati, nec aliter ordinari quam vos; Testamentum Divinum legimus pariter*, as *Optatus*, p. 72. All the Controversie was, which Party should be uppermost, whether the Party of *Cecilian* or *Donatus* were the truest and most regular Bishops and Pastors of the Church; and what havock they made of the *Orthodox Bishops and Churches*, hath been shewn in a late History of the *Donatists*.

But for the proof of this, he sends us to the *Necessary Erudition*, and quotes a large Paragraph to little purpose: for it shews onely, *That one National Church may not impose their Traditions and Ceremonies on another, as the Church of Rome would, affirming, That certain of their Laws and Ordinances are of such estimation, that they be of equal force with the Word of God; and that whoever disobeyeth and transgresseth the same, committeth deadly sin*. This, though it be in the midst of the Paragraph on the ninth Article of the Creed; the
Pre-

112 No PROTESTANT, but

Prefacer, after his wonted Candour omits, and applies it to *Parochial Churches* under the same Polity, when the Reformers expressly apply it to *several Churches*, such as *England, Spain, Italy, Poland*, and the Churches of *Corinth and Italy*, which were far distant in place one from the other. And the inference made by those Reformers from that Paragraph, is this: *Whereby it appears, that the Unity of these Churches in sundry places assembled, standeth not by knowledging of one Governour in Earth over all Churches*, (i. e. of the Pope and his Laws.) But these men would infer, *That particular Parochial or Congregational Churches may be united, though they differ in Doctrine, Government, and Worship*; as we know that the *Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independant, and Anabaptists* do.

And as for the instance given, p. 12. of *several different Offices used in this Nation in times of Popery*; one after the use of *Sarum*, another of *York*, &c. yet all united: I answer, 1. These men do not so abhor the practices of the Church of *Rome*, but that they can make use of them to serve their own turns. 2. These Offices were all *Liturgies* prescribed by the several Bishops, without any considerable difference: which much varieth the case between a *Liturgie* in one Parish, a *Directory* in another, and *neither of these*, but irregular and confused *Enthusiasms*, in a third, and all in one Town. 3. Nor do I think that these several Parties would agree that their Pastors or Bishops, though of their own chusing, should compose *Liturgies*,

rituaries, and impose the use of them in their several Congregations, as was done in those darker times of Popery. But in those days there were no *Directories* set up against *Liturgies*; nor did their *Liturgies* differ at all in the greatest Offices; or if they had, yet being performed in an *unknown Tongue*, it had been all one to the People. But while the *Papists* run into one extremity of a *blind Obedience*, and swallow *Camels*; we should not run into another, and strain at a *Gnat*, rejecting every thing commanded by Authority. Suppose the established *Liturgie* be used in one Parish, the *Assembly-Directory* in another, and *Mr. Baxter's more correct Netherbe* in another, and *Dr. Owen's purer Administrations* in another, so pure, that the *Lord's Prayer* is accounted *ridiculous* in comparison with them; and the wild *Enthusiasms* of *Anabaptists* and *Quakers* in other parts of the City: would not these *Dissidents* compose a sweet harmony for the *Songs of Zion*?

Another proof of this lasting Union, is from the Agreement that is in the Nation, notwithstanding that several Towns and Corporations have distinct *Charters and Customs*. To which I answer, That the different Opinions and Practices of *Separate Congregations*, have had a very evil influence upon Corporations, (the Members whereof have been unaccountably divided) and such practices used, as might justly forfeit those *Charters*, and dissolve those Corporations: It is therefore *Unity in Religion and Worship* that is the most probable means to

114. NO PROTESTANT

preserve them; and where those little bodies are divided, they are not like to stand long by our Saviour's Rule of a kingdom or a house divided.

Secondly, those Corporations and Little Societies are all under the Common Laws of the Nation and cannot make any Municipal Laws contrary to them; but upon the abuse of their Liberty their Charter may be forfeited. But these Congregational Assemblies are so absolute and independent as being of Divine Institution, that they can give check to Princes, and put off all such Commands as agree not with their ends with *It is better to obey God than men*. So that it is like to be with us under such a Constitution, as when there was no King in Israel, when every one did what seemed good in his own eyes; and Calves were set up from Dan to Bebel, the true worship of God at Jerusalem being suppressed. Or when there were many Kings in the Heathen and Brittain in every Congregation. But the truth is, it is not more necessary for the preservation of distinct Trades, that their Constitutions should differ than for the preservation of Christian Churches, that all who live under the same Government should be guided by the same Laws for Doctrine, Worship and Discipline. And this the Governants of all men are obliged (as they think) to enforce by their Covenant, viz. To bring the Church of God in the three Kingdoms to the nearest Unity and Uniformity in Religion, Confession of Faith, Form of Church government, Directory for Worship and

the DISSENTERS Plot. 115

and Catechizing. So that the Covenant must be renounced in this grand Article, or the New Mass must fall before it.

P. 13. We have one admirable effect, more of this new Constitution, (*viz.*) That it will put an end to that horrid sin of Schism that hath these many years abounded in the midst of us. If Schism be such a horrid sin, would you have it established by a Law? or can you think that the Independent and Anabaptist Meetings were not Schismatical, because they had Protection by the Sword under John of Leyden, or our late Usurping Powers? By the like method, War may be utterly extinguished in a Country, if it be turned into a Wilderness, and without Inhabitant: *Solitudinem faciant, & pacem vocant.* When all Sects are tolerated, who is the Great Schismatick, but he that procures the Toleration?

And the Demand which follows is as unreasonable: Let the Dissenters be permitted to embrace the Laws and Customs of their Forefathers in the Apostles days about Church-Discipline and the mode of Worship, and they are relieved. As if the several Modes of Episkopal, Presbyter, Independent, Anabaptist, &c. were all Apostolical. Indeed there were Heresies and Schisms then in many of the new-planted Churches; and one Egg is not better like another, than the practices of the Separate Congregations are to those Sekt-makers, as St. Jude, vers. 19. terms them, which are described 2 Cor. 1. 24.

116 No PROTESTANT, but

If they pretend to any thing of *Apostolical Antiquity*. It must be to the Opinions and Practice of the *Gnosticks, Nicolaitans, Alexander the Copper-smith*, and such as *Diotrephes*, that prated against the *Apostles* with malicious words; *Epist. Joh. v. 10.* seeking for *Preeminence* to themselves. Now if the Constitution of the Churches at that time were *Congregational*, as they contend, then that Constitution was not such a preservative of Union as these men pretend: and in truth, *St. Jerome*, who speaks most against Bishops of any of the Ancients, says, *They were appointed as a remedy against Schism*, even in those Apostolical days; when one said, *I am of Paul*, &c. And if *St. Hierome* be to be believed in this point, these *Schisms* grew up when the Church was governed *Communi Presbyterorum Consilio*, by a parity of Pastors, when there were *Factions* (*Studia in Religione*.) And then *Episcopacy* was set up as a remedy against *Schism*. *Ne unusquisque ad se trahens, Christi Ecclesiam rumpere*: lest every Pastor drawing Disciples after him, should divide the Church of Christ. *Epist. ad Evagrium*. And *Mr. Calvin* observes the same. That this *Episcopal Government* was agreed on, *Ne ex equalitate, ut fieri solet, dissidia nascerentur*.

No less strange is that other effect, *That this cannot satisfy any moderate Episcoparian, (viz.) first, That the nature of that Office be declared to be no other than what was anciently in this Kingdom.* So far I think we shall agree upon what

the DISSENTERS Plot. 117

what hath been proved concerning the ancient Government. But that the Bishops were anciently the *Kings Creatures* (as to their Function) that *ALL THEY DID* was in the *Kings name*, and by vertue of a *Commission* received from him, is contrary to what hath been sufficiently proved, and cannot but offend the Conscience of any (but such as your Country) *Conformist*.

P. 14. *We are not for pulling down Lord Bishops, nor for alienating Church-lands, if it seem good to our Governours to continue them.* This was often * declared and solemnly protested by these mens predecessors in 1640. even when the *Royal Martyr* was (according to his *Conscience* and *Coronation-Oath*) resolved to stand and fall with them: and our present *Dissenters* affirm it onely with an if, *If it seem good to our Governours to continue them.* But it hath been already

* In the Protestation, May the fifth 1641. the Parliament promised to maintain the true Reformed Protestant Religion expressed in the Articles of the Church of England.

April the ninth, 1642. the Lords and Commons declared, That they intended to take away nothing in the Government and Liturgie of the Church, but what shall be evil and justly offensive, or at least unnecessary and burdensome.

But then comes the *Covenant*, and strikes at the *Root and Branch* together.

confessed, that the *Plot* is laid; *Materials* are ready, the *Dissenters* are all confederate, and the *Solemn League and Covenant* still in force; there wants but some *Master-builder*, and colour of *Authority*

118 No PROTESTANT but

thority real or feigned, and then hands to work, their *contrary Protestations* notwithstanding. And what work such hands did make heretofore, is fresh in memory. When the *Bishops* were pulled down, and their *Lands* alienated, and the *Presbyterians* ready to divide the Spoil: it was taken out of their clutches, and converted to their destructions.

These *Dissenters* speak their design, p. 14. they wish that where there is one *Bishop* now, there may be five; some *Presbyterian*, some *Independent*, some *Anabaptist Bishops*: for though they hate the Name and Office of a *Diocesan Bishop*, yet they love the Honour and Preferment, and declare they will not refuse it if they are called to it: and if they may obtain them by the Kings Commission, as his Officers circa Sacra: and then they are not for alienating *Church-lands*, any more than for taking from his Majesties other *Civil Officers* the *Pansions* allowed them for their great services, of which we had lately a most dismal Outcry: They know the *Church-lands* (i.e.) of *Bishops, Deans and Chapters, Prebendaries, Vicars Choral, &c.* would make four or five such competent *Bishopricks* in every *Diocess*, as would be very acceptable to the Leaders of the several *Factions*: and with such a Model established by Law, these *Dissenters* declare they will be satisfied, p. 15.

The Original of this *Congregational Episcopacy* is by some ascribed to *Socinus*, who knowing that the *Synods* of the *Reformed Churches* in *Poland* would

would condemn his *Errours*, thought on this Model of *Independent Churches*, that should be accountable to no Synod or Council for their Opinions or Actions, farther than by way of advice: which is what *Mr. Baxter* and these *Dissenters* contend for. But what security can these *Congregational Bishops* give, that they will not aspire to a greater *Superintendency*, but keep to their particular Flocks, and not commence *Episcopal Episcoporum*? It is an Observation of *Archbishop Spotswood*, That of all men those who at first pleaded for a Purge in the Ministry, none could less endure it, and loved more to command. *Dr. Owen*, *Hugh Peters* and *Mr. Nye* were great Assertors of this Way; yet when they were got into power, they exercised more than *Archiepiscopal Authority*, for confining and ejecting Ministers through the whole Nation. There were some such men advanced in the Church of Scotland by the name of *Visitors*, who had their fixed residence in Cities and great Towns, who by the first Constitution were onely to observe the behaviour of the Ministers, the manners of the People, the provision made for the Poor, and the like; but in a little time, they assumed *Episcopal power*, electing and ordaining Ministers, presiding in Synods, directing all Church-censures; nor was any Excommunication pronounced without their Warrant. And *Mr. Baxter* hath thought of several Arguments already to assert the *Divine Right* of such Bishops.

120 NO PROTESTANT, but

P. 14. N. 3. This doth noway embase his Majesties Prerogative in matters Ecclesiastical, but rather makes it more grand and august. His Majesty is hereby acknowledged to be Supreme Head of the Church. All Officers circa Sacra depend on his Majesty for their places, as much as any other Civil Officers, &c. How much his Majesties Supremacy hath been disputed by the Presbyterian Classes and Synods, the instances of Scotland and England do plainly declare. And the power of electing the several Pastors of those Congregations so earnestly asserted to be the Right of the People, by which means, as Queen Elizabeth was truly informed, there would be a power distinct from hers set up in the Church: which is also proved by *Denis Du Moulin*, That this is *adiscare imperium in imperio*, to set up the Consistorian Chair above the Royal Throne. But his Majesty doubtless is the most competent Judge what Ecclesiastical Constitution is most agreeable with his Prerogative. His Royal Father I am sure was sufficiently sensible, how tender these men were of his Supremacy in Causes and over persons Ecclesiastical; who would not allow him the attendance of his Chaplains in his greatest extremity, and continually grieved him with their Disputes against *Episcopacy*, *Liturgie*, &c. from Newcastle to Newfort, and then to the *Isle of Wight*; and despised his Authority when he silenced them by his Arguments.

The last benefit of this new Model is, p. 15

That it erects a Partition-wall between the Reformation and the Corruptions of the Roman Church, the only way of breaking all the designs of the Papists, and to secure us from the danger of Foreign Usurpations. And therefore they desire the Dean and his Substitutes to consider this Proposal, which is but a revival of what on our first leaving Rome, was strenuously asserted, as the only way to break those designs. *Ans.* How strenuously it was asserted by our first Reformers, hath been already considered: And what advantages the Church of Rome propose to themselves, if they could reduce the Church of England to so great confusion, the instructions of Campanella and other Jesuits, the Confession of Coleman, and Dr. Oates his Testimony, may sufficiently inform the world; and our own experience, which is the Mistress even of Fools, may convince us of this Nation, for it is confessed by all Parties; and the particular Arts and Methods used by the Emissaries of Rome, to begin, foment, and carry on our Divisions, are recorded in divers Histories beyond any denial. Take the relation of it from the words of these Dissenters, p. 4. of their Reply, speaking of the rise of our late Troubles: *'Twas the Papist* (say they) *had the sole hand in the Plot; no Protestant* *could believe ever designed the unhappy product of the Hellish Conspiracies of the bloody Papists.* Then sure some of those which are now accounted Sound Protestants, viz. some Presbyterians, Independents, and Anabaptists, were not such in those days:

days: for their Votes, Declarations, Petitions, and Actions, shew that they were too active in those unhappy Products, how hellish and bloody soever they were. For (as they go on) *this was long ago discovered by Dr. Du Moulin, and since by Dr. Oates, and most exactly related by Dr. Heylen a Son of the Church, in these words: A Confederacy was formed among them (i.e. the Papists) consisting of some of the most subtle heads in the whole Jesuitical Party, by whom it was concluded to foment the Broils begun in Scotland, and to heighten the Combustions there. (And how they were begun and fomented in Scotland, appears by the Presbyterians soliciting the King of France for his Aid in a War against their native Prince; and how and by whom the War was carried on in England (though the Jesuites might act incognito) is very notorious.) But this (say they) was done, that the King being drawn into a War, might give them the opportunity to effect their Enterprize for sending him and the Archbishop into the other World: which being by one of the Party on compunction of Conscience made known to Andreas ab Habernfield, who had been Chaplain, as some said, to the Queen of Bohemia, they both together gave intimation of it to Sir William Boswell his Majesties Resident at the Hague. Now how can any but the Dissenters believe that the Archbishop, who, they say, p. 91. was a cordial Friend to the Church of Rome, or his Party, should conspire with the Papists to begin that*

that War, when their Death and Ruine were known to be designed by the Romish Faction. If the Papists influence any Party for the effecting those bloody and hellish Designs, it must undoubtedly be that Party which carried them on, to the utter destruction of the King, the Archbishop, the Church and Kingdom of England.

But if the Papists had a chief hand in raising our late Wars, and one means to effect it was by destroying those, as Papists, who were most devoted to the Church, and consequently the greatest enemies to Popery; why should it seem incredible (when we see the same methods used by the same men) that the same ends are designed? For whereto are these following Suggestions directed, but to such an end? as, *That the Conformists under the notion of running down Dissenters, are preparing to meet the Church of Rome*, p. 26. and p. 48. *I shewed the tendency of his Discourse, which I thought to be for advancing the Papal interest. — This is your Notion, and for ought I know the Deans; a Notion that is the same with that of the French Papacy, that doth but fairly lead us to Rome*, p. 49. of the Reply.

But why this Consideration is especially commended to the Dean, (i. e. Dr. Stillingfleet) unless it be to infuse a Jealousie into the Peoples heads that he is pulling down that Partition-wall between us and Popery which these Dissenters are building up, is unaccountable. So p. 15. *I desire the Dean and his Substitutes to consider this Proposal,*

124 NO PROTESTANT, but

posul, which is but a Revival of what was on our first leaving Rome strenuously asserted as the only way to break all the Designs of the Papists about Church-discipline—Certainly the establishing this Notion cannot but be of extraordinary use, as it erects a Partition-wall between the Reformation and the corruptions of the Roman Church. As if they had told the Dean in Mr. Baxter's words, You are for a separating Wall, or dividing thorny Hedge in the midst of this part of the Vineyard of Christ, to separate one part of the faithful Ministers and People from the rest: but we make it the most earnest action of our lives, to have prevented the building of this Wall or Hedge, and do as earnestly desire to see yours pulled down, and will do the best we can while we live to pull it down, though it be by going on both sides of the Hedge (i. e. sometime siding with the Papists, and sometime with the Fanaticks) and though by so doing we be scratched. All this they will do and endure, to destroy Episcopacy as established by Law, and set up in its stead this new Partition-wall of Independent, Presbyterian, and Anabaptistical Congregations; which having no foundation to support them, nor any thing but untempered Mud and Slime to cement them, will fall to a heap without any blast of opposition, and leave an Open Avenue for the Papists to enter by.

It is no great wonder if they who prefer such a Babel before the best established Church, do make comparisons between the incomparable Dean and their

their own Scriblers, as if he had no more Learning nor Religion than themselves. As for Learning, they are not ashamed to say, That Mr. Baxter hath as much pos'd the Doctor, as ever any Boy in the higher Form at School was pos'd by his Master. That the Doctor hath treated the Dissenters in his Book with haughtiness and contempt. p. 118. of the Reply. That he is one, as well as others, who may be willing to learn; or else he is sure he will have the more need to be taught of Mr. Baxter. Thus Mr. Humphries. p. 111. And again: The Doctor may look on himself to have Abilities in some regard which Mr. Baxter hath not: but if he should value himself with Mr. Baxter as a professed Divine, he must want that modesty in good earnest, whereof he makes a shew in the beginning of his Book, upon a comparison of his with Bishop Jewel. The Doctor hath his Excellencies otherwise, but he hath not Mr. Baxters: the Doctors Sash is made of Tree-stones; you shall have from him polished Learning: Mr. Baxters is made of Flint: you shall have from him a true Truth. Mr. Baxter: I will say of One like the man in the Neighbourhood whose first cry, and all the Neighbours come for fire to his house. (A grand Boutefeu.) A man indeed extraordinary, from whom the present Age do fetch light, and unto whom the Ages to come will bring honour. Above all, Mr. Baxter is a holy man, who will be for ever greater in his once refusing a Bishoprick, than the Doctor can be in getting one, if the present ill-managing this Cause doth not preclude his having any. And it is
matter

matter of real offence to me, that so learned a man, so honoured throughout the Nation, should prove a proud man, a disdainful person; which temper, if indulged, is so intolerable to God and man, that it will hurt any man into the dust. 100 This, and more is repeated by the Country Conformist, and made his own, by adding, *This Witness is true*, p. 119. of the Reply. Moreover, the Country Conformist thus excused all Mr. Baxter's railing against the Dean: *I confess he is a plain man, and uses but little courtship or ceremony in his Writings. He hath a very quick and earnest temper of mind, and his style is keen and pungent: but spleen and anger are things to which Mr. Baxter is a stranger.* And he thanks Mr. Humphries for that he hath plainly and modestly rebuked the pride and haughtiness of the Doctor. 101

As for Mr. Baxter's Learning, I have said already, whoever reads the Epistle to the *Vindication of the Primitive Church*, &c. may be sufficiently informed what a Master he is of the Greek and Latine Tongues, and how well acquainted with Antiquity. (Of which I to save the Reader labour) I shall repeat an instance or two. Instead of consulting the Greek Authors which he quoteth, he makes use only of Translations, not considering their Errors. So from Dr. *Yanmar's* Translation, he says, *That Hypatia taught in the Schools which Plotinus composed*; when the Original is *ἡ δὲ ὑπάτιος ἐκείνη ἡ σχολὴ ἣν συνέταξε Πλωτῖνος* Which *Plotinus* renders, *Scholam*

the DISSENTERS Plot 127

Plotinus deducam; (i. e.) he taught in the Platonick School descended or continued down from Plotinus; not which Plotinus continued; for Plotinus taught in those Schools a hundred years before Hypatia was born. But because Mr. Baxter doth not pretend to be a Critick in the Greek, and writes a great Volume in Latine, the instances of his perfection in that Language are very pleasant. Thus, *Ita ad Comitatum*, is to go to the Palace of great Princes. And *Sacrae literae* (Imperatoris) are the divine and terrible Scriptures. So the *Calami acuti* wherewith the Boys killed Stephanus, he says were sharp Quills. If this prove him not a Master of that Language, yet that discovery which he makes of adding to the Canon of Scripture a new book called *Ordo Historiarum*, as inserted by a Council at Rome under Pope Gelasius, doth it fully. Yet was he so short-sighted, that he could not look farther, and see another such Canonical book added, called *Ordo Prophetarum*; which were onely general Titles to the Historical and Prophetical Books.

But if Mr. Baxter be not so learned, yet he is a holy man. His holiness can sanctifie and justify any Cause, Action, or Person, and canonize as good Saints as ever his Holiness at Rome did. Such I mean as died in Actual Rebellion against their Prince. The second part of the History of Separation will shew how much he excels Dr. Gillingham in holiness.

But Mr. Lob in his Enquiries and Reply, saith directly

128 No PROTESTANT, but

directly on the Dean, as if he intended by his *History of Separation* to gratifie the Roman Faction. And when in p. 9. of the *Reply* he comes to excuse the matter, he makes it worse. *I was express in distinguishing* (saith he) *between the Dean's own intent, and the tendency of his Treatises; between the finis Operis and Operantis: for though the end of the Work it self cannot but in its tendency prove pernicious to the Protestant Religion; yet I hope the Doctor designed it not as such.* As if he had said, Either the Doctor knew what he wrote, or not: if he did not, he was an ignorant rask person, and hath done a great deal of mischief to the Protestant Religion, though unwittingly: If he did know, then he did designe to gratifie the Romish Party, and to weaken the Protestants: for the end of the Work cannot but in its tendency prove pernicious to the Protestant Religion. And Mr. *Wad* adds, He was charitably disposed to make this distinction; and that he was very civil in these thoughts of the Reverend Dean. But he will not be so to others, whom in his *Title-page* fixed in the most publick places of the City, he proclaims to be *Projectors for a Conjunction with the Church of Rome*. So that by the Testimony of these three true Protestant Witnesses, the Dean, and whoever writes in his defence, are by the Rabble sentenced as *Papists*; and if they had power, should be as certainly executed as *Bishop Laud* (another *Projector for Rome*) was; or *King Charles* (who was censured as such also.

the DISSENTERS Plot. 129

Are not these men ashamed, after the discovery of these Impostures, and horrible Confusions that followed on them, to seek to enrage the People again, and put them on the like barbarous actions by such incredible Fictions, when they cannot but know, and have confessed, as to our former distractions, that *the Papists improved our Divisions heretofore*, to the same ends, and by the same arts as our *Dissenters* use and employ now, exposing those to the malice of the *Rabble*, as *Papists*, who were the greatest Enemies to Popery?

And as to the Dean's entire affection to the *established Religion*, in opposition to *Popery*, his many learned and seasonable Writings against Popery, even then when the *Dissenters* abetted a *Toleration* of it, have evinced to the world that he took his *life* in his hand, and *counted it not dear unto him*, when he exposed it to the attempts of that *Bloudy Party*, who were more like to silence him by their *Swords* than their *Pens*. If it be made a property of a *true Protestant*, to cry down such men as *Projectors* for *Popery*, it will raise a just suspicion that the *true Protestant* hath but a *false heart*; and under colour of the name, really acts against the thing.

But seeing no man in *England* is comparable to *precious Mr. Baxter*, there was one beyond the Sea, *St. Ignatius* by name, who had as great skill in modelling a *Holy Commonwealth* as *Mr. Baxter*, and was *Dominus utriusque Gladii*: though he

never

*Excell
& found
of the
Jesuits*

never employed them against his native Sovereign, yet was he and all his Disciples as great Enemies to the *Episcopal Function*, as Mr. Baxter and his Disciples, having by some unadvised acts rendered themselves incapable of it. And for their *Obedience and Loyalty to Christian Princes*, it is very disputable which Party doth excel.

But as for the *Divines of the Church of England*, Dr. Burnet (for which particular he deserved the Thanks of the Nation, as well as for any other Relation in his Book) hath left a far different Character both of the *Dean* and the *Conformist Ministers*, from what the *Dissenters* give them. He thinks his History was much commended by the approbation of the *Reverend, Learned, and Judicious Dean*. And as to the rest of the *Clergy*, he affirms in his *Preface to the second part*, God hath not so left this Age and Church, but there is in it a great number in both the *Holy Functions*, who are perhaps as eminent in the exemplariness of their lives, and as diligent in their labours, as hath been in any one Church in any Age since Miracles ceased. The humility and strictness of life in many of our Prelates, and some that were highly born, and yet have far outgone some others from whom more might have been expected, raiseth them far above censure, though perhaps not above envy. And when such think not the daily instructing their Neighbours a thing below them, but do it with as constant a care, as if they were to earn their Bread by it: when they are so affable to the meanest Clergymen that come to them, when they

the DISSENTERS Plot. 131

they are nicely scrupulous about those whom they admit into Holy Orders, and so large in their Charities, that one would think they were furnished with some unseen ways; these things must needs raise great esteem for such Bishops, and seem to give some hopes of better times. Of all this I may be allowed to speak the more freely, since I am led to it by none of those Bribes either of Gratitude, or Fear, or Hope, which are wont to corrupt men to say what they do not think. But I were much to blame, if in a Work that may perhaps live some time in the world, I should only find fault with what is amiss, and not also acknowledge what is so very commendable and praise-worthy. And when I look into the inferior Clergie, there are, chiefly about this great City of London, so many, so eminent, both for the strictness of their Lives, the constancy of their Labours, and plain way of Preaching, which is now perhaps brought to a great a perfection as ever was since men spoke as they received it immediately from the Holy Ghost; the great gentleness of their Deportment to such as differ from them, their mutual love and charity, and in a word, for all the qualities that can adorn Minister or Christians; that if such a number of such men cannot prevail with this debauched Age, this one thing to me looks more dismally than all the other affrighting symptoms of our condition, that God having sent so many faithful Teachers, their labours are still so ineffectual. So the Doctor. And it is worth the Dissenters consideration, by whose opposition, slanders, and reproaches, most unchristianly

stianly instilled to the People, these dismal and affrighting Symptoms have been caused.

The Doctor need not substitute any person to vindicate either the reputation of his *Learning* or *Religion* from the impotent attempts of such empty Scriblers: He hath so fatally smitten them by *one blow*, that he needs not strike a *second time*; nor is he at leisure *actum agere*, to write over the same things, as some of these *Dissenters* have done ten times. But many inferiour persons perceiving how he hath so broken their teeth that they can bite no more, are very confident so to gag their mouths, that they shall not be able to bark against a person so much above the reach of their malice.

These *Dissenters* had certainly consulted better for their own credit, if they had walked by their own Rule, *p. 15. The States-men know best how to alter, correct, or amend any thing in the present frame; for which reason, Modesty (a rare Vertue in Dissenters!) doth best become Divines, who never succeed in any undertakements beyond their sphere.* The truth of which Rule these *Dissenters* have proved by this their Adventure, beyond all contradiction. It is high time therefore that they put an end to this Crack of theirs, whereby they boast that they have fully shewn how easie 'tis to put an end to the mischievous Divisions which have for some years past proved very dangerous to this Kingdom; for all the Wits of Rome cannot contrive a more effectual and expedite way to renew and increase all our former miseries.

And

And I suppose they have sufficiently made good what they say the *Defence of Dr. Stillingfleet* talks of, *The impossibility of Union between the Church of England and the Dissenters*, p. 17. for if this be the *Only way of Concord*, that the foundations of the established Church must be razed to the ground, before their Synagogues can be raised; it is utterly impossible there should be a Union between the things that are, and the things that are not. I question not but the Authors of this *Reply* may agree, especially in pulling down the present Constitution; and herein, they say, *the Dissenters in general are agreed*: but as to the setting up another in its room, I think they will no more agree in 82 or 83, than they did in 42 or 43, and the succeeding years; when the *Civil War* was not more earnestly prosecuted between the *King and Parliament*, than *Uncivil* (I cannot call them Ecclesiastical Contests) between the *Presbyter and Independent*. Though these two Factions were most like to agree, and now are made the same thing. Let the Reader that is unsatisfied herein, read the *Savoy-Disputes*, *Edwards Gangræna*, *Dr. Baskwick of Independency*, *Bayliff's Dissuasives*, *Rutherford against Cotton*, *Cawdry against the same*; or, which may suffice, *Cawdry against Dr. Owen*; proving *Independency to be a great Schism*; and that *Toleration had done against Religion*, to root it out of the hearts of the people, in seven years, more than the enforcing of Uniformity did in seventy years, p. 14.

134 No PROTESTANT, but

All that he says to persuade the possibility of an Agreement between the several Sects in this Model, is, because the *Country Conformist* agrees with Mr. Lob and Mr. Humphries; which if he do, we may believe him to be a *City-Nonconformist*, rather than a *Country Conformist*; or some Jesuit, who under that pretence, thinks to do the *Dissenters* the better service. For though Mr. Baxter profess himself to be *Episcopal*, *Presbyterian*, and *Independent*, and these *Dissenters* add *Anglican* too; yet a *Conformist* cannot be transformed into all these shapes; nor can any *Conformist* think, as these men suggest, p. 18. *That the opposition made by any of the Nonconformable Clergie against the peaceable Dissenters* (as they call themselves) *doth justifie the French in their rigorous and most cruel persecutions*: Whereas our *Dissenters* do rather condemn those afflicted Protestants, as if they exposed themselves to the displeasure of their Prince (not upon the weighty account of avoiding *Idolatry* and other *destructive Errours*, but onely) for not complying with the publick Worship of the Nation, by reason of two or three *innocent Ceremonies*, as our *Dissenters* do, and were as ready to subvert the established Government as some among us are.

The sixteenth and seventeenth pages are spent to prove what I know none do deny as much as themselves, (*viz.*) *That the Church of England, with the authority and concurrence of their Head and King* (I hope they make the King their Head)

might

might examine and reform all errors and corruptions, whether in Doctrine or Worship: That the Nation did in several Ages assert the Kings Supremacy; and as a truth in conjunction therewith, held, That in the Primitive Church the Bishops in their Councils made Rules for ordering their Diocesses, which they only called Canons or Rules: nor had they any compulsive authority but what was derived from the Civil Sanction. To all which the Conformists do more willingly subscribe than the Dissenters do.

P. 17. Mr. Lab finds great fault with the Dean's Defender for his rude and slovenly methods in aspersing his Adversaries. But if his treating of his Adversaries be compared with the manner of these Dissenters treating their Friends, I mean the first Reformers, (as hath been shewn) it will appear that their Panegyrics are more abusive than their Satyrs, and their Dedications meet Defamations. For whereas the whole Preface is but one continued Lye, they affix that great Name to it as a Bell to carry the sound of it through the Nation, and to make it a Libel indeed, according to the Lord Bacon's description: *A Libel is a Lye with a Bell at one end of it.*

It is a shrewd signe of a desperate Cause, when the Defenders of it are beaten from one fallacy to another; from the inexpediency and insignificance of Ceremonies, to the great sinfulness of Conformity, and the mischief of Impositions; then to the unlawfulness of Liturgies, without the use of free Prayers: Then

136 No PROTESTANT, but

to the *incroachments and tyranny of Diocesan Bishops*, pretending it to be against the *Primitive Institution*: And now against the *Constitution of the Church of England as reformed*; and to colour this, to make those first and best Bishops of the Reformation to bely their own solemn and publick Writings, and constant Practice. This is to make *Lyes their Refuge*, and to hide themselves under falshood. It might have been pardonable, had these things been whispered onely in their Conventicles, or had they been led into them by some Mistake or Errour; or if they had barely published them, without a malicious application of them against the *established Church*. But to put these Lyes in print, and dedicate them to One (which is in effect to all) of the *Privy-Council*, who are all but one great Minister of State, and are all Members of that Church which they thus seek to destroy; and to presume to have these things represented to his Majesty, is such an accumulative comprehensive Forgery, as that I should have wanted a word whereby to express it, had not Mr. Baxter coyned one for me, (*i. e.*) *It is meer Diabolism*: for the Devil is the Father of Lyes, and of every one that loveth and maketh a Lye. And if these things be done by a Junto of Divines (as Mr. Lob says, p. 18. of the Preface, *These our joynt Endeavours*) what may we expect from the *Tavern and Coffee-house, and Conventicle-Clubs*?

And whereas Mr. Lob asperseth the *Dean's*
Sub-

Substitute (as he calls him) for using such *rudely and slovenly methods as deserve not the regard of any sober person*; I perceive that the *Dissenters* are not all of one mind: for *Mr. Humphries* takes him for *a person that requires their regard*, p. 139. But whether he or the *Dissenters* deal more slovenly, let the Reader judge, by what they tell this very learned and candid Author, p. 99. *That he had his information from Beelzebub the Father of Lyes*; and would teach the Dean to rebuke him in their own Language, with a *Get thee behind me, Sherlock*; or as another of them hath it, *Get thee behind me, Satan*. But *Clodius accusat*. Never did any man write more rudely and slovenly than *Mr. Lob*, who bears a Signature of slovenliness in his very name. When I was in the University, if any man had done a nasty stingy trick, we were wont to call him a *Lob*. And a verier Lob than *Mr. Stephen*, never set Pen to Paper.

One loud boast of theirs I cannot let pass without a remark, p. 17. where they say they have *so fully shewn how easie it is to put an end to the mischievous Divisions which have for some years past proved very dangerous to this Kingdom*. Answ. It was just so easie for *Archimedes* to remove the Globe of the Earth by his Engines; but the difficulty was, he could not contrive where to fasten his Engines: and if he could have overcome both these difficulties, he would have turned the world to a Chaos again. And if these men could do what Christ hath promised the *Gates of Hell* shall never

138 No PROTESTANT, but

never do, to prevail against the established Worship and Government which hath been for sixteen hundred years together continued in his Church; could they fix their false insinuations, which are their chief Engines, in the hearts of those who are yet *Sound Christians*, and make them as *fanatical* as themselves; what could the effect be, but the destroying the foundations of Religion, and running all into confusion?

When I had read and considered the aim and arguments of these mens Writings, it called to my mind the Gladiators of *Rome*, who voluntarily entered the Lists, and to please a People that delighted in Bloud and War, for a day exposed themselves to such Wounds and Scars as they were sure to carry to their Graves with them.

By this time the face of the things proposed is much altered; the *fucus* is fallen off: *Qui color albus erat, nunc est contrarius albo*: yet the forehead remains still the same. To conclude (say they) *the peace of the Church of England* (which they have consulted to destroy utterly) *and the greatness of the King who is the Head of it* (and cannot be divided from it, but to the ruine of both) *are the things which in these Papers we have shewn our good will to do something towards the advance thereof.* *Ans.* These are not the Onely Papers or Engines which they have employed to advance the *peace of the Church of England*, as they term the *subversion* of it. It hath been done not with Pen and Paper onely, but with Fire and Sword;

The DISSENTERS Plot. 139

Sword; and the King (the Head of it) was made a glorious King, as the *Dissenters* of that Age promised; but they sent him into *another world* first. And the world can bear them witness in what manner they have shewn their good will to advance the greatness of our present Sovereign, by lessening his Revenues, his Reputation and Power at home and abroad.

And they hope others will shew their good will too for the advance of the *Good Old Cause*; to which end, they submit it to the *superiour thoughts of some one who is in a higher sphere of ability for the cultivation of it*. But I believe they may as soon persuade an experienced Husbandman to plow and sow *Goodwin Sands*, which are every twelve hours turn'd up with the wind or waves, as any *States-man of ability or integrity* to cultivate such *Quicksands* as these. Were *Themistocles* alive to undertake their designe, and should he not miscarry in the Attempt, yet could he not propose any other Reward when he had done his work, than an *Ostracism* for his labour.

But this they say will adde the *Title of August* to his Majesty. I doubt not but his Majesty is so well satisfied with the Title of *Head of the established Church*, that he will never exchange it for that of the *August Head of the Church in New England*, or *Hogan Morgan Head of the Congregations of a new Amsterdamb*. His martyr'd Father esteem'd it his greatest Title to be called, and his chiefest Glory to be *The Defender of the Church*, both
in

140 No PROTESTANT, but

in its *true Faith* and its *just Fruitions*; equally abhorring *Sacrilege* and *Apostacy*. Chap. of the *Covenant*.

But that you may see how boundless the modesty of these men is, *They hope that some man of high place will represent the Plot without prejudice to his Majesty, and that it will be well accepted by him.* As gratingly no doubt as it was by his Father, who chose rather to sacrifice his *Life*, than to give up the *Church as a Prey to such Cormorants*.

Was it not presumption high enough to think of trepanning *Noblemen* and *Privy-Counsellors* to be Accessories to their bold designe, but that they must aspire to make the *Kings Majesty* a Principal in it? Doth he not intimately know both the *men* and their *conversation*, better than to sacrifice his *Crown* and his *Life*, and the *established Religion*, which is as dear as *both* to him, to their *false pretences*? Yet since they have *appealed unto Cæsar*, to *Cæsar let them go*. And that their designs may be presented without prejudice, I have endeavoured to discover the *naked truth* of this *Good Old Cause*, and hope it will be accepted according to its merit.

They hope also *it will take with every body else who do truly honour the King, seek Concord, and love good men.* Where I observe, that as they begun the *Dedication* of their Work with *The glory of the King, and the peace of the Church*, so they end their *Preface* with *the honour of the King, and seeking of*

Con-

the DISSENTERS PLOT. 141

Concord; they had quite forgot the fear of God, though that hath been sometimes preacht up against the honour of the King. And if we may guess how much they fear God, by their honouring of the King, and seeking the peace of the Church, it will evidently appear, that they had no fear of God before their eyes from the beginning of the Work to the end thereof.

It was a severe Censure which a learned man gave of Mr. Baxter's Church History (and a Demonstration the truth of his Censure) That the Book seems to be written to shew how much Mr. Baxter wants of a Scholar and a Christian. And I suppose the Demonstration which I have made in this and the following Papers, is as plain as any in Euclid, that these Dissenters have written this Preface and the following Half-sheet, as a Manifesto to the world, that they have formed A Plot against the established Church of England; and that they have used very vile Arts in procuring false Witnesses to confirm the same. And if hereafter the People be enclined to think that the same men may have a Plot also against the State, these men have given just occasion for that suspicion; for they who make no conscience so shamelessly to avow and promote the fall of the one by such indirect practices, cannot be thought very tender of the preservation of the other; or over-conscientious what Instruments they employ in it, seeing that the welfare of the Church and State are so nearly related, that (like Harpocrates Twins) they

141 No PROTESTANT, but

they usually live and die together. And in brief, the Plot against the Church is so mischievous, that nothing can parallel it; but the impudence in forging and racking Witnesses, that are of a contrary mind, to affirm it.

Job 24. 2. Some remove the Land-marks; they suddenly take away flocks, and feed thereof.

Deut. 19. 14. Thou shalt not remove thy Neighbour's Land-mark, which they of old time have set to above Laberitane.

And I suppose the Demonstration which I have made in this and the following Papers, is as plain as any in English; that these Dissenters have written this Preface and the following Manifesto as a Manifesto to the world, that they have formed A Plot against the established Church of England; and that they have used very vile Arts in procuring false Witnesses to confirm the same. And if hereafter the People be inclined to think that the same men may have a Plot also against the State, these men have given just occasion for that suspicion; for they who make no conscience to themselves to sow and promote the fall of the one by just induced practices, cannot be thought very tender of the preservation of the other; or over-conscientious what instruments they employ in it, seeing that the welfare of the Church and State are so nearly related, that (like the Harpocrates Twins) they

OF THE

Half-sheet,

CONTAINING

MATERIALS for UNION.

IT is a good Rule which the Prefacer presented (though he observ'd it not :) *Modestly* doth best become Divines, who never succeed in any undertakements beyond their sphere. How he is like to succeed, that hath endeavour'd to impose such things on the King and Council as were certainly beyond his sphere, a little time may evince. These Materials are to be proposed to the next Parliament that shall sit about this business to purpose, p. 142. of the Reply. The like Materials were provided during the sitting of that Parliament which pass'd the Act for Uniformity, and order the like former Acts. It is not above Mr. Humphries sphere thus to censure the Acts of Parliament. But now (saith he) that we have a new Parliament,

144 No PROTESTANT, but

ment, and that after another dissolved, we may expect quicker work. Yet will the proposing these things still to view, have their use both for suppressing such as have said, The Nonconformists know not what they would have; and setting some measure to our desires, and the Parliaments condescensions about the same. So Mr. Humphries in his *Peaceable Resolution*, and p. 170. — Now it seems they were not much mistaken that said, *The Nonconformists know not what they would have*; nor did they then set measures to their Desires: they have taken new measures of the expected Parliaments, and enlarged their desires accordingly. For in the year 1680. when these Resolutions were printed, they tell us, (p. 180. of that book) *A Bill for Comprehension, with indulgence, would do their business*: but now there must be a *new Constitution of the National Church declared by Parliament*. They are in truth so variable in their demands, that what would please them one year, doth displease them another; and I see so little hopes of a firm and lasting Union from the Proposals in the *Half-sheet*, that I am well persuaded the sober persons among the Dissenters would in less than one year be as much dissatisfied with the New Model as the Conformists. Mr. Humphries hath laid aside his first Materials, though he had taken some pains to lick them into the form of a Bill; and whether upon second thoughts he may not also reject these, I leave to his farther consideration.

Whereas (saith he) there are three sorts of
 Prote-

Protestants in the Nation, the Episcopal, the Pres-
 byterian, and Independent or Congregationalists;
 which are of **DIVERS SORTS** &c. no less sorts
 then there are not three sorts only; for the Con-
 gregational men are of divers sorts. There are
 Anabaptists, who in our Authors judgment are
 Sound Protestants; there are Benedictines and Qua-
 kers, and Free-willers, and I know not how many
 more; and all Congregational men, and perhaps as
 good Protestants as some sort of Anabaptists.
 These also come under Mr. Humphreys Notion of
 a National Church; and you see he made procla-
 mation in his Bishop, 1791 *Booby Christian Subjects*
 throughout the Land what profess (the Reformed Re-
 ligion, and be so married to Popery &c. And he tells
 us in the Epistle to the Reader of *the Portable*
Devotional, sent out by some Ministers of London, 1793
 that he was willing that the Papists should be
 tolerated. How unparalytic them both Mr. and
 relate this matter, p. 92. of the *Reply*! Seeing
ONE DISSENTER has been banished for the
 forbearance of a more numerous Papist, &c.
 Now all the former sorts, and many others, pro-
 fess the Reformed Religion, and so ought to have
 their Congregations established by Law as parts of
 the National Church. For if they shall be, who
 shall Mr. Humphreys? we shall not touch
 them on the head. No God forbid. Neither must
 we suffer them to ruin other mens Souls as well
 as their own; or to knock us on the head; but
 endeavour by lawful and moderate means to make
 them

the DISSIDENTIAL PLAIN 247

Church, even from the beginning is agreeable with the saying of St. Paul, Christ loved his Church and hath given himself to the death for his Church, to sanctifie her, and make her holy, in cleansing her by the fountain of water in his Word. So that no man can be of this Church, but he which is cleansed with the Sacrament of Baptism, like as the Jews before mentioned Jewish, where Christ saith, Whosoever is not born again of water and the Holy Ghost, shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. What need saying that out of the Church without Infants who are then as far as saved, they must needs be Christened and cleansed by Baptism, and so incorporated into the Church. And in the infancy of the Children of the Hebrews in the Old Testament did not let, but that they were made partakers of the grace and blessing given in Circumcision, even so in the New Testament the infancy of Children doth not let, but that they may and ought to be baptized, and so receive the graces and virtues of the Sacrament, and as they lend a hand before, they being offered to the Faith of the Church, receive the graces of their lives, and such graces of the Holy Ghost, that if they die in the state of their infancy, they shall thereby undoubtedly be saved. And then it follows, All good Christians, and not only the Anabaptists and Pelagian Opinions, which are contrary to the promises, and every other man is given agreeable to the said Anabaptists or Pelagians, in that behalf, for doctrine, and utterly to be condemned.

And if this be the Case of the meer Anabaptists, whom you repute Sound Protestants, what shall we think of this other sort of *Rank Anabaptists*, such as Dr. Barker says, p. 111 of the second part, *Davied almost all the Principles of the Christian Doctrines*, men of fierce and barbarous tempers. They had broke out into a general Revolt over Germany, and raised the War called the Peasant War, and possessing themselves of Munster, made one of their Teachers John of Leyden their King, under the Title of the King of New Jerusalem. Some of them set up a fantastical way of talking of Religion, which they turned all into Allegories. 59

This sort of Anabaptists were long since brought into England. In Edward the Sixth's days, as Dr. Bucer says, Some Tradesmen in London being brought before the Kings Commissioners, were perswaded to abjure their former Opinions, which were, That a man regenerate could not sin: That though the outward man sin, yet the inward man sinned not: That there was no necessity of penance: That Christ was truly a body, yet not a man: That God was truly a body, yet not a man: That all we lived by Christ, who was the way to Heaven: That there was no flesh of the Virgin, and that the Baptism of Infants was unnecessary. Soon after, a swarm of more than a hundred

And if we found the most sober of these Sects, *Presbyterians, Independents*, and the most *Unitarians*, so fierce and cruel in the late Wars, what greater confusion should we have run into, if these sort of men, which too much abounded.

mong us, had been let loose. And what security can be given, that if the *meer Anabaptist* be made a part of our *National Church*, he will not degenerate into such Monsters as those were?

Where ever was there an Attempt to erect this *Babel of Congregational Independent Tyranny*, but it hath been blasted by a confusion of Languages, and a numerous division still: propagating subdivisions so intolerable, that *John Lilburn*, who was in his Opinion for a Toleration of All Religions, had much ado to keep his hands from them. *Ephraim Pagitt's Heresiologie*, and *Edward's Gangrena*, shew us how soon, and to how great a number, these pernicious Sects increased.

The like dismal effects these *Congregational Assemblies* produced in *New England*, where *Presbytery* was broken by *Independency*, and this by *Anabaptists*: And when the Men had carried themselves so scandalously, the Women undertook a farther Reformation: and *Mrs. Dyer* and *Mrs. Hutchinson* broke in pieces the Congregations of *Robinson* and *Williams*. And at last *Mrs. Hutchinson* separated from all the rest, as being the *Only Spouse of Christ*. And what other effects can be hoped for, if, as *Mr. Humphries* would have it, every Party be left to their own Opinions about the Church and Discipline of it?

As long as the King had any Armies, the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* seemed to be united; but in the year 1649. when they had destroyed

240 NO PROTESTANT, but

him, they were at open Wars. Could I have believed (saith Mr. Baxter) him that would have sold you five years ago, that when the Scorners of Godliness were subdued, and the bitter Persecutors of the Church destroyed, that such should succeed them (who suffered with us) who were our intimate friends, with whom we took sweet counsel, and went up together to the House of God, &c. should draw their Swords against each other, and shed each others blood so fiercely? O what a potent instrument for Satan, is a misguided Conscience, &c. Saint Basil, p. 193. Thus did Union commence in those days of Liberty.

— These (several Factions, as the Author says) do and will ever differ in their Opinions about the Church and Discipline of it, in the Question, Which is of Christs institution, or whether the one or the other is most consonant to Scripture. *Ans.* Is it not strange, that they who agree with the established Church in Doctrine and Sacraments, and in a Liturgie, and differ onely in some disputable parts of Government and Discipline, should keep at an irreconcilable distance from it, and profess and practise all manner of Hostilities against it for a Reformation, and yet can fancy a firm and lasting Union between those who differ from them, not onely about Government and Discipline, but in fundamentals of Doctrine and Sacraments also? And when each Faction pretends their own Form to be of Divine Institution, and the rest to be Antichristian, it is probable they will contend as the

the DISSENTER'S Plot 141

Presbyterians did for theirs. That this and others are the very Scepter of Jesus Christ, to which all the rest must bow, and be broken. But if they can agree to live peaceably with all these Sects, and, as they say, p. 150. Can go occasionally to their Assemblies for maintaining the National Union, can they not do so much with the established Church, and conform as Lay-persons with that? If they can agree among themselves in every thing, and with the established Church in nothing, it is evident, that it is not their *Cannot*, but their *Will not*, that keeps them off from our Communion, at least as Lay-persons.

It is here (saith Mr. Humphries) we must lay the foundation-stone of Union. *Ans.* Such an aggregation of Sand and Slime will not make a Stone fit for any foundation, except of such a Babel: for what doth this Foundation differ from such a Toleration as Mr. Baxter speaks of? The hand of God is apparently gone out against your ways of Separation and Anabaptism—and will merciful Rulers set up a Trade for butchering of Souls, and allow men to set up a Shop of Poison for all to buy and take that will, yea, to proclaim this Poison for Souls in Streets and Church-Assemblies? (In the Epistle Monitory to Self-denial, and herein he lays a better foundation for Union than Mr. Humphries.) You must either tolerate all men to do what they will make a matter of Conscience or Religion, and then some may offer their Children in sacrifice to the Devil, and some may think they do God service in killing his

152 NO PROTESTANT, but

Servants, or else you must tolerate no error or fault in Religion, and then you must advise what measure of penalty you will inflict. Cure of Church-divisions, p. 363.

But this is the method devised by our Adversaries of Rome, who doubt not to dash us in pieces on such a Foundation-stone of Unity. And thus we shall prove the Papists to be true Prophets, who told us, That having left their Church, we should keep tumbling from one Form to another, until at last we should return to them again. (which God forbid.)

Mr. Humphries. When the Parliament then shall sit about this business, a Bill should be brought in for declaring the Constitution of our Church of England. A Parliament is the Representative of the whole People of England; and I doubt not but by consent and agreement they might make a New Constitution of the Church as it is National, and much more may they declare the Constitution of it.

We have seen whose Journey-men these Builders are; you see now whom they hope to make their Journey-men: The Bill is ready drawn for the Parliament; and though they might make a New Constitution of the Church, yet they are only to declare the Constitution of our Church of England. But what is that which they call our Church of England? Is it that which they pretend to in the Preface, of which we have discoursed at large; or this in the Half-sheet, which is as

incon-

inconsistent with the other, as *Dagon* was with the *Ark of God*? And I trust we shall never see such a Parliament again, as will establish *Inquiry by a Law*, and cast off their Mother for such a Monster, as Mr. *Humphries* calls, *An Independent-National Church-political-of-humane-institution*, which should consist of the several Assemblies before-named.

Mr. *Humphries*, p. 148. *A Discrimination between the tolerable and intolerable, is never to be gainsayed by any wise man.* *Ans.* But where shall we find so wise a man as will undertake such a Discrimination? Or how will Mr. *Humphries* secure such a wise man that he shall not be gainsayed? Mr. *Humphries* is a man of *Carbolic Charity*; he is for tolerating the *Papists* and *Anabaptists*. Mr. *Baxter* thinks himself as wise as he; and he hath declared against the Toleration of either. I prefer that Rule of Mr. *Baxter*, That they onely are to be tolerated, who are like to do more good than hurt; provided that the Magistrate be admitted to be Judge in the case, which Mr. *Baxter* also grants.

Mr. *Humphries*. It is not for me, or any one person, but a Convocation, to prescribe the terms of National Communion. But I would have all our Assemblies that are tolerable, to be made legal by such an Act, and thereby parts of the National Church as well as the Parochial Congregations.

Ans. But if the National Constitution established by the King, Parliament, and Convocation, have not prevailed to unite us, who seem to differ onely about

Church-

154 No PROTESTANT, but

Church-government, what hope is there that the declaring so many different Assemblies, who, as you grant, never did nor will agree in that point, but each of them have contended that their own is *Jure Divino*, will maintain the Unity of our *National Church*, or that they will not subdivide, and make new Breaches (the Laws notwithstanding) as your selves have given them an Example. Though Mr. *Humphries* saith it is not for him to prescribe, but for a Convocation, yet he doth not onely tell us what he would have, but hath drawn up a *Directory-bill*, to supersede the work both of the Convocation and Parliament, as if this were the *Onely way to unite us*: for the Parliament-power is abridged; and though they might make another, yet they are permitted onely to declare this Model.

Mr. *Humphries*. That the Bishops should be declared Ecclesiastical Officers under the King, acting circa Sacra onely by vertue of his Authority and Commission.

Ans. We have seen some inconveniencies of this Project already: One more is very considerable. Bishops we must have of all sorts, *Presbyterian*, *Independent*, *Anabaptist*, &c. Now what if these being declared Bishops at first onely by the Kings authority, should afterward plead that they hold their Office from the King of Kings, and no Earthly power is superiour to them to hinder them in the execution of their Office; and then if he do but touch these Mountains, they will smoke, and cast forth Lightnings and

and Thunder, and such a horrible Tempest, as will make even Moses himself to fear and quake exceedingly.

That which raiseth this suspicion, is not onely the late actings of some Congregational Bishops, notwithstanding the Laws are against them; but a Position of Mr. Baxter concerning such Bishops, whom he calls Archbishops, and says, That they succeed the Apostles in the ordinary part of their Government, as in p. 127. of his Directory, part 3. second Edition, where he shews Reasons for the continuance of this larger sort of Episcopacy in the Church; and then whatever the King declares, if they have a *Jus Divinum*, you have heard the consequences, viz. That the King hath nothing to do with them, (&c. ut supra) but their authority remains good, though the Prince should oppose it. And then Ja. Goodwin's Doctrine of Resistance may be revived, which, he says, was not known in the Primitive times, but is reserved for such an Age as this.

And let it be remembered, that Mr. Baxter asserts, That the Congregational Bishops have no need of Ordination; as these Dissenters grant of the new Archbishops: the Kings appointment of these, and the Peoples election of the other, is sufficient. And when we have no Priests, what Sacraments shall we have, or how shall they preach or profit the People? See Rom. 10. 15. and Jer. 23. 32.

Mr. Humphries. As Jehosaphat appointed Officers for government in the matters of God, and the Kings

Kings matters; So should Bishops be in our Ecclesiastical, as the Judges are in the Civil matters, the Substitutes of his Majesty, and execute his Jurisdiction. *Ans.* This Scripture is almost as well applied, as *Curse ye Meroz* was wont to be. For were *Jehosaphat's* Church-Officers of Gods appointment, or did they act *circa Sacra* onely by the Kings Commission? Had Mr. *Humphries* consulted the Text, 2 *Chron.* 19. 11. he might find that the person who was set over all the matters of the Lord, was *Amariah* the chief Priest, and the Priests and Levites under him: he did not take out of the lowest of the people, and make them Chief Priests by Commission: that was *Jeroboam's* work. Besides, *Jehosaphat* being returned to *Jerusalem* in peace, thought it fit for the continuance of that peace, to quicken his Ecclesiastical and Civil Officers to put the good-old Laws in execution, *vers.* 11. *Deal courageously, and the Lord shall be with the good.* Shall I think that Mr. *Humphries* was ignorant of the true importance of this place, or that he wilfully wrested it? I wish I could say something to excuse it from an evil designe. Such an interpretation might pass in a popular Harangue in some profelyted Conventicle, where the People swallow all that comes out of their Preachers mouth, and reward them liberally for it: But to publish such things in so learned an Age, to offer them to the Kings Council, and to impose them on King and Parliament, argueth more their confidence to be hardy and daring, than

the DISSENTER'S Plot. 1697

than their Consciences to be tender. And how unfit such men are to quarrel others for not understanding their Text, who so injuriously wrest their own, let those that read make their own eyes judges.

Mr. Humphries. Upon this account, if any of the continent among the Nonconformists were chosen to be Bishops, they could not refuse it. Let two or three the most fit of those parties be the next that are called to the Function upon such an Act, and commanded to hold it, and then would Union indeed commence. *Ans.* I think that we have here in very deed the Summa totalis of these Dissenters desires. They have so vehemently declaimed against the established Bishops, that they should be the most contemptible and scandalous persons alive, if such as Mr. Baxter, &c. should accept of a Bishoprick *in statu quo*: yet they are very reconcilable both to the name and thing, whether it be declared to be *jure Humano*, or *Divino*; neither are they for alienating the Bishops Lands; no nor against the Title of Lord Bishops neither, so they themselves may enjoy them. Their modesty, forsooth, expects they should be commanded to accept the Bishopricks, and then they cannot refuse it, though hitherto they cried *Nominus Episcopatus*, as much as any Popish Bishops of them all. And Mr. Baxter, and Dr. Owen, who declared Prelacy to be a meer Antichristian encroachment on Gods Inheritance, (*I thank your Ser.* Octob. 22, 1691.) must be chief Prelates.

But

But here is a *Salvo* for all Objections and Scruples of Conscience against Bishops that have hitherto been started: *Let two or three of the most fit of each party* (of the Nonconformists) *be the next that are called to this Function; or, as they express in other words, chosen to be Bishops.* Chosen then they must be, but by whom? Not by the King; for he doubtless would, with good *Israhaphat*, appoint the *Chief Priests* whom God hath chosen, to be his Officers *circa Sacra*. The right of such elections is contended for (as with Teeth and Nails) to belong to the people. And all other impositions whatsoever are not so intolerable, as to have either their *parochial*, or these *superiour Bishops* imposed on them. Mr. Baxter is said to be writing one Book more (I hear) to vindicate the privileges of the People in such Elections. And it is the grand business of these men, as it was of the old Comedians, *Populo ut placerent, quas fecissent fabulas*; they tell the people they have much more right to chuse the Guides of their Souls, than to chuse their Physicians, Lawyers, or Schoolmasters; and the King may as well chuse their Wives for them.

And thus they have made their Election sure for whoever are most popular among the several factions, who generally are such as are most disaffected to his Majesties Government, will undoubtedly be chosen for Bishops and Archbishops over the several parties. Then Dr. Owen may be Archbishop of Christs Church, and Mr. Baxter of

the DISSENTERS Plot. 159

Kedderminster and the Country adjacent: for the ancient Titles of *Canterbury* and *York* will be too invidious. And Mr. *Alsop*, Mr. *Humphries*, and the Country Conformist, may be *Archbishops* also over the *Popish* & *Anabaptist* Congregations: and we shall see *Lay-Bishops* and *Archbishops* too, instead of *Lay-Elders*; for no Ordination is required! Yet we should see Mr. *Baxter's* twelve sorts of *Bishops*, *Bishops* of all sorts and *Trades*: and this would be a *Thorough Reformation*. And then says Mr. *Humphries*, would *Union* indeed commence; yes doubtless; from that very day that we are thus broken in pieces, these *Archbishops* would bind us up in so many *Cords of Sand*. There was a time when only two of these *Parties* appeared with any show of Authority in the Land, and yet what *Strivings* and *Contentions* did they cause in the Bowels of the Nation! *Sal. Gaudin* and *Ques* were the *Congregational* Patriarchs; The *Smectymache* were the *Presbyterian*. But what *Unions*? The many Books printed for and against *Presbytery* and *Episcopacy*, for and against *Independency*, for and against *Patronage*, the Dispute between them in the *Stony*, the Revolt of many leading *Presbyters* to *Independency*; their supplanting and defaming each other; the Emulations and Contentions among themselves; as that between *Milton* and *Burton* at the first plantation of *Presbytery* in *Scotland* which was so great, that one set up a *Presbytery* at *St. Andrews*, the other at *Comper*, in opposition to each other.

160 No! PROTESTANT, but

Quibus Cuckis non sufficit totum Nemus
For two such Black-birds all Dodona's grove
Sufficed not to keep in peace and love
 Thus Dr. Owen, Pastor of the Church of Christ at
 Evesham in Essex, supplanted Dr. Reynolds Dean
 of Christ Church in the University of Oxford.
 There was a time when the Cathedral at Exeter
 was rent in two, and a Partition-wall erected be-
 tween the Presbyterian and Independent Congre-
 gations; nor was there any other Party to mo-
 lest them. But what Union there was then a-
 mong them, the printed Books yet in being do
 declare. One Mrs. P. of the Independent Church
 went occasionally to the Presbyterian assembly,
 and professed a respect for them; and Mrs. A.
 though of the Independent Church, procured her
 Child to be baptized by a Presbyterian. These
 Crimes are aggravated against them, and the In-
 dependent Church proceed to excommunication for
 breaking the Church Covenants; for they
 adjudged 2. That lesser Crimes, increased with con-
 tempt of Church admonitions, became
 worthy of excommunication. And it was coun-
 selled by advice from several Ministers, as a
 Manifest Truth, that though they were gathered
 another fold, yet the Rod of Discipline should be la-
 yered towards them. Though some, as of the
 Presbyterians, were angry at it. One of them

prints his *Diatrepbes detected*, by E. T. who tells them, *That it was iniquity, given their solemn Meeting: that their Curse, causeless, as, The Devil take her, or, Take her, Devil, torment her and vex her, would not come*, p. 16. The Husband of Mrs. A. hearing what was done against his Wife, at a solemn Meeting, with Fasting, Prayer, and a long Sermon afterward printed, is charged with *jeering the Lamentings and Mourning* which God was pleased to bestow on his People by the working of his Spirit, which he blasphemously called (saith the Author of *Manifest Truth*) a hideous howling Cry, and accounted the Censure as the Popes Bull when it roars loudest, p. 22. And he is repayed by a Report, *That his Wife had persuaded him to separate from the Independents, to save the charge of raising a Gallery in St. Peters West*. E. T. tells the Independent Pastor, *That he was more kind to the Cornish-women, with whom he joyned in Spirit, while they were the Mouth in Duty*, p. 5. and that he was ashamed to think how much short he came of them in the Gift or Spirit of Prayer; and hoped this practice of the womens praying with the men, would come more into use. And p. 12. *Are you not ashamed to make them swear (as you interpret your Church-Covenant to be an Oath) that they will submit to your Teaching and Ministerial Guidance, without any limitation, restriction, or proviso mentioned therein? whereas that which was required to Lay-Elders, was according to the Word of God.* Such was the Union between those two most sober of the Sects,

when they had the whole City and Country at their Devotion. The Common People love Novelties and Changes; they will be gadding and carrying Tales; they will magnifie one Pastor to the debasing of another, and so engage them in their Quarrels, and then Church-censures will be abused to avenge private Animosities: and what Peace can there be, where there is no Remedy for such Disorders?

Mr. *Humphries* is sensible how the many inconveniencies of *Congregational Episcopacy* by this *One onely means* may be salved. And why is this the *One onely means*? Mr. *Baxter* differs from this; and he says his is the *Onely way of Concord*. They that stick to the *Covenant*, are for *Presbyterial Uniformity*, as the onely means, &c. And why may not the present establishment be as good as any of these? Mr. *Humphries* is sensible of many inconveniencies of *Congregational Episcopacy*, from some potent, turbulent, and refractory Members: And may not our *present Diocesans*, as impowred by his Majesties Ecclesiastical Laws, and who have no dependance on the people, better cope with such stubborn Members, than those that owe their Elections to them? The truth is, our *Dissenters* have given such an instance of contumacy against lawful powers, that it will be a wonder if their Scholars do not learn of them. And then *Union will commence*.

Mr. *Humphries*. *This shall advance and not lessen the Outward power and honour of the Bishops.* And

We must take Mr. *Humphries* word for this; and these *New Bishops* will be much obliged to him for advancing both their Power and Honour. I thought that our *established Bishops* had in the account of these men *too much* of outward power and honour already; yet our new Bishops shall exceed; they shall be *Patriarchs*, and *Metropolitans*, and *Plenipotentiaries*; They that against Law oppose the powers that be, will usurp much more when they have the Law to countenance them. But suppose the King will preserve the present *Episcopacy* as now, they cannot expect more power and honour than they have; and it is impossible but there must be a decay of both: for the Members of the *Congregational Churches* must be gathered out of the *Parochial*; from which they will not depart without a Contempt, or some such *modest Reflections* as Mr. *Lob* and Mr. *Baxter*, &c. have made on *Parochial Pastors* and their *Diocesans*.

And whence shall the exceeding power and honour of the *new Bishops* arise? Will not the Title of *Lord Bishops* satisfy them, or do they expect to be saluted by the name of *Your Holiness*? Will their *Congregations* maintain them in more outward splendour and power, than the *Bishops* now have? You declare that you would have *five or more Bishops*, or in your Language, *Archbishops*, where there is now but one. Certainly these *Archbishops* must have as great a power over their *Parishes*, as some of their *Congregational Bishops* have over their *Consciences*, to advance the honour and power

164 No PROTESTANT, but

of an hundred more Bishops than now there are, above that of the present Bishops.

They say, They are not for alienating Bishops Lands. Be it so; and suppose the Lands of Deans and Chapters, Vicars Choral, &c. be all made a Fund to maintain the honour and power of these Bishops; we know when the Lands of King, Queen, Prince, and many Nobles were added though the power of some few, such as Dr. Owen, Philip Nye, H. Parson did exceed, yet their honour was not transcendent. I have heard of building Castles in the Air; These men are for building Churches, and endowing them there also. One shall have his Diocess in the Circle of the Sun, another in the Territories of the Moon, the rest in the Planets of Saturn, Venus, Mercury, &c. and then there is no great fear of their interfering; but these Bishops being thus fixed in another world, our Union here below would commence.

Mr. Humphries. I humbly motion a third Clerk for The Convocation to be added to the two in every Diocess; and chose out of the Nonconformists, &c. *Ans.* A very Humble Motion indeed! They will have five or more Bishops for one in the Convocation; and to what number soever their new Diocess increase, though they have but five in every Diocess as now settled, their number will exceed that of the two Clerks now to be chosen; so that they will be assured of the major part in the Convocation, and their Resolves Mr. Humphries expects should be moulded into Canons;

so that we shall have *Canoneer Bishops* still: but these Canons shall not be such *murdering Engines* as the former have been: *These*, saith Mr. *Humphries*, will kindly prevent all our *Scruples*; they that *strained at a Gnat*, will swallow these *Camels*; and the whole Nation will be rendered happy in the satisfaction of both Parties. The *Conformist* is one, and all the *Nonconformists* are the other: These are insatiable, and the other will be greatly dissatisfied. But will these things satisfy? No: for Mr. *Humphries* says, *These*, and other things of such a nature as these—So that the *Only way of Concord* is not yet perfect; it may in the next Edition admit, as Mr. *Humphries's* other Project for the toleration of *Papists* did, many alterations and additions. When a few *Canons*, maturely deliberated on and established by King and Parliament, as well as the Convocation, have been made the occasion of such great Dissentions; what Magical power must theirs have, that no man shall speak of *Liberty of Conscience*, or the *Mischief of Impositions*, or propound any *Scruple* against such new Canons? I know no possible means to effect this, except they can persuade the People that the Pope hath usurped the Title of *Infallibility* which belongs to them: And this may be no hard work, seeing the People are already persuaded that they preach and pray (singly) by the Spirit; and therefore much more, when so many zealous men that have the Spirit indwelling in them, their Canons may be held to be Canonical.

166 No PROTESTANT, but

Mr. *Humphries*. By this means shall one Organ more be added to this great political Society, for deriving an influence from this Head to those parts of the Body, which now seem neglected, and to have no care taken of them. *Answ.* I thought by what hath been declared hitherto, that the King should have been the Head of this glorious Body; but it seems they intend this new Convocation to be the Head, for deriving influence to the neglected parts of this Body. This will end the dispute concerning the Head of the National Church, and let Mr. *Humphries* have the glory of beating out the Notion. This Head will far exceed that at Rome with his Triple-Mitre. Yet I shall prefer St. *Cyprian's* judgment: *Qui nec unitatem Spiritus, nec conjunctionem pacis observato, sed se à Sacerdotum Collegio & Ecclesie vinculo separat, Episcopi nec potestatem habere potest, nec honorem.* Epist. ad Anton.

However, Mr. *Humphries* hath provided one Lesson for this many-headed Convocation to learn, and then *To decree that neither Church shall unchurch one the other: That no Member of either shall depart from one Church to the other, without a sufficient peaceable Reason: That when a man hath his choice to be of one Church, which he will in regard to fixed Communion, he should occasionally come also to the other, for maintaining this National Union.* But what if the Members do depart from their first Congregations, not without some sober Reflections on them; and the Fewd grows so high, as that the

the DISSENTERS Plot. 167

the Churches unchurch each other (as hitherto hath been done) who shall compose the difference? *Answ.* The Archbishops, who are the Kings Officers. *Reply.* These are chosen by the several Churches, and likely will judge for them to whom they owe their Elections; and so the difference will engage them against each other: And who shall reconcile these Reconcilers? Must the King be troubled with Appeals, or Convocations called on all such petty Differences? which will inevitably and ordinarily come to pass. Or will the Canons extend to every particular case? And shall they be reputed *Schismaticks* that will not conform to those Canons? But *Bernardus non videt Omnia*; a thousand Ruptures will arise, which we can no more foresee by looking on this *Foundation-stone of Union*, than by looking through a Mill-stone. So that this *new Organ* and *new Canons* would in a short time sound as harshly as the old ones did; and we should have as perverse disputings against *these*, by *Quakers* and *Freemillers*, as against the former by Dr. Owen and Mr. Baxter.

And why might not the *Quakers* that come to Dr. Owen's Congregation, as they did sometime at *St. Maries* in Oxford, keep on their Hats in the time of Prayer, and justify it from Dr. Owen's putting on his at the saying of the *Lords Prayer*, and shew as much contempt still, as he once did when in his 34th Chapter of his Book against *Biddle*, he did more mischief in decrying the use of our Saviours

Prayer, than he did good in all the rest of his Book: for he says, That there is no promise of acceptance annexed to the saying of that Prayer; and that the using of that Form doth delude and barden innumerable poor Souls: — That it is as a Charm or kind of Witchcraft in Gods Worship: That it confirms many in their Atheistical blaspheming of Gods Spirit; and that the repetition of it is in plain terms ridiculous. The same with what he had delivered, p. 669, of his *Vindiciæ Evangelicæ*, with much more, in a Treatise purposely written against the use of it. So that probably we shall have one new Canon against the use of our Lords Prayer in the Congregational Churches.

Mr. Humphries. An Act of Parliament to this purpose, would make the Church of England to be in earnest such a Church as the Church-men would have us still think it, the best constituted, the most exemplary, and the most glorious of any that is, or indeed that well can be in this world. Answ. Yes doubtless, there never was such a Church heard of in Christendom until now. If Alphonsus had been consulted with at the Creation, and Mr. Humphries at the plantation of the first Churches, we might have had great amendments in those Divine Works: This New Jerusalem would parallel that which St. John saw to come down from Heaven. Instead of the twelve Apostles, Mr. Baxter's twelve sorts of Bishops shall be the foundation; and precious Saints, instead of precious Stones: They will need no Temple, nor Ordinances; every

one shall be directed and comforted by the light that is within him. And the Kings of the Earth shall bring their glory and honour to it. But I fear the Walls of it will not be so great and high, as to keep out of this New Jerusalem whatsoever defileth, or worketh abomination, or maketh a lye. See Rev. 21.

This triumphant Church cannot be raised, but on the Ruines of this which is now *Militant*: and when this is destroyed, we may sooner see pitiful insects, creeping things, and swarms of such unclean creatures as are Food ready fitted for a Prey to the Roman Eagle, than another Phoenix out of her ashes. And who would not rather trust himself under *Christs Banner*, and the Conduct of an undefiled Dove with an Olive-branch in her mouth, than be exposed to a multitude of Vultures or Birds of Prey?

Wherefore until you can name some other Church in Christendom, better constituted for Doctrine and Discipline than the Church of England (which I never yet heard any to do) give the Church-men leave to enjoy their Opinion, That ours is the best constituted, the most exemplary of any that is yet in the world.

We were told in the *Preface*, how much this would advance the Greatness of the King, who was to be Head of this Church: But now it seems he must suffer himself to be unheaded, to make way for another.

And I believe his Majesty would not rake it for an

170 NO PROTESTANT, but

an additional Honour, to exchange his present Title of *The Defender of the Faith*, for that of being a *Protector of Hereticks and Schismatics*; nor that of the *supreme Head of the Church of England*, for a pretence of making him a *Fifth Monarch, King of Saints*, and higher than the *Kings of the Earth*, when he is owned by this Church, which they say will be *the most glorious of any that is, or indeed well can be in the world*. He shall have as many Monarchs under him, as there are Bishops, all Independent and absolute, being by *Divine Right*; which they will not grant to the *Kings of the Earth*. He may be as a Stadtholder-general, depending upon these Independent Bishops. A few Chains they have provided, and those not of Gold neither, to oblige their Kings withal; for if these Archbishops prove themselves to be *Jure Divino*, as Mr. Baxter hath attempted, and as is asserted of all the Congregational Bishops, then the King shall have *nothing to do with them*, &c. (as you have already heard :) for it was an old *designe*, to bring this great Head under the feet of the Presbytery. T. C. p. 645. an ancient Oracle declared, That *Princes must remember to submit themselves to the Church, and to submit their Scepters, and throw down their Crowns, yea to lick the dust of the feet of the Church*. And the book of Ecclesiastical Discipline saith, p. 142. That *Kings no less than the rest, must obey and yield to the just authority of Ecclesiastical Magistrates*.

And it must needs be so, if, as Beza taught,
every

the DISSENTERS Plot. 171

every Presbytery is the Tribunal-seat of Christ, De Presbyt. p. 124. Dr. Owen, p. 18. of his Sermon on Dan. 7. 15. saith, *There is a perpetual antithesis and opposition between the Kingdoms of the world and the Kingdom of Christ.* P. 43. *All Kingdoms must serve the Church, or be broken in pieces, and cease to be Kingdoms.* P. 45. *The Nations of the world being of the Father given to Christ, he may deal with them as he pleaseth, and either bruise them with a rod of iron, and break them in pieces as a potters vessel, Psal. 2. He may fill the places of the earth with their dead bodies, and strike in pieces the heads of the Countries, Psal. 110. Or he may make them his own, and bring them in subjection to himself.* But by whom will Christ execute these things? Answ. *The Gospel being the Rod of his Power, and Scepter of his Kingdom, it will interest any People in all the promises that are made for the using of the Church to thresh, break, destroy, burthen, fire, consume, and slay the Enemies thereof,* p. 47.

Nor is Mr. Baxter far behind. *The Discipline of Christ* (saith he) *though all parts of the world have opposed it, yet where hath it been so fiercely and powerfully resisted? the Lord grant that this Nation fall not under that heavy doom, Luke 19. 27.* But for those mine Enemies that would not that I should reign over them, bring them hither, and slay them before me. *Saints Rest,* part 3. p. 91. Dr. Owen spake much to the purpose of making this Head of the Church a glorious King, in a Sermon preached Jan. 31. 1648. *He that is entrusted*
with

172 No PROTESTANT, but

with the Sword, and dares not do Justice on every one that dares do Injustice, is afraid of the Creature, but makes very bold with the Creator. The Text which the Doctor chose after his Majesties Defeat at Worcester, shews his good intention to King Charles the Second, to be no better than that to Charles the First: it was Ezek. 17. 24. *I the Lord have brought down the high tree, have exalted the low tree, have dried up the green tree, and have made the dry tree to flourish. I the Lord have spoken and have done it.*

It is too well known against whose head the Sword was sharpened by that acute Doctor. His Principles are as ill-boading to King Charles the Second, as the First. In *The labouring Saints dismission to rest*, p. 7, 8. *All forms of Government among men, if they either so degenerate of themselves, that they become directly opposite; or are so shattered by providential Revolutions, as to become useless to their proper end, may and ought to be changed: And that the universal disposal of Governours is rouled on Prudence, to act according to present circumstances.* And in his Sermon, Octob. 13. 1651. *That the Croil powers of the world, after fearful shakings and desolations, shall be disposed of into a useful subserviency to the interest, power, and kingdom of Jesus Christ: hence they are said to be his kingdoms, Rev. 11. 15. (i.e.) to be disposed of for the use of his interest, rule, and dominion, p. 15, 16. Of this you have plentiful promises, Isa. 60. When the nations are broken in opposition to Sion, their ruine*
must

THE DISSENTERS Plot. 173

must be consecrated to the Lord, and their substance to the Lord of the whole earth, Mich. 4. 15. Even Judges and Rulers must kiss the Son, and own his Scepter, and advance his Ways. And p. 49. The Lord will certainly make good his promise, that the Kingdoms and Nations that will not serve the Church shall utterly perish, *Iſai. 60. 12.*

This may give us a glimpse of that glory which will cover the Land when this Fifth Monarchy shall be uppermost. A glorious King, and glorious Churches; glorious Bishops, and glorious Canons; glorious Saints, and glorious Ordinances: All so transcendently glorious, that the lustre of them (if they do not quite extinguish) will so dazzle the eyes of such as survive, that they will not be able to behold it. *Excellens sensible l'adit sensorium.*

But how well doth this new Model of the Half-sheet agree with that in the Preface, p. 15. That their Proposals are but a Revival of what on our first leaving Rome was strenuously asserted, and that they are onely against unaccountable Innovations, such as tend to the ruine of the old Protestant National Church, of which they are the great Defenders?

But says Mr. Humphries, Is not all this too Eristion? He answers, No. And there is no great fear that they will yield too much to the Magistrate; for the Magistrate hath but a humane Right; and the succession may be altered for many causes, in the judgment of these Dissenters; but

but every Pastor and his Flock are of Christs institution, and have a compleat power of Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline; and what Christ hath committed to his Church, cannot be taken away by any. But is this the Case of all the Congregational Churches, that differ both in Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline? or if Presbyterian, Independent, and Anabaptists Congregations are of Christs institution, why is that of the Episcopal excluded? or if it be as divine as those others, why is not the Magistrate to protect and maintain this power as well as the rest? and so we may not be exposed to the hazard of such alterations. But the plain truth is, That though they allow the Magistrate power to destroy Episcopal and Parochial Order, yet they deny to him, as well as his Bishops, whether of the old Constitution, or of their new Invention, any power over their Congregations, as to Doctrine, Worship, or Discipline: which how arbitrary and contradictory soever it be, they cannot be deprived of it.

The Presbyterians are said to be no Changelings, but firm to their first Principles; and if so, they will never yield too much to the Magistrate. Some of their Principles sum'd up by Bish. Bramhal in his Book of the Scottish Discipline, were, 1. That the Kirk hath power to appoint times and places for their National Assemblies. 2. That they have power to abrogate all Statutes and Ordinances concerning Ecclesiastical matters that are found noysome and unprofitable. 3. That Ecclesiastical Discipline ought

the DISSENTERS Plot. M 1751

ought to be exercised, whether it be ratified by the Civil Magistrate or no. 4. That from the Kirk there is no reclamation or appellation to any Judge Civil or Ecclesiastical within the Realm. 5. That to their Discipline all the Estates, as well Rulers, as they that are ruled, must be subject. 6. That matters of the Pulpit ought to be exempted from the judgment and correction of Princes. And, to name no more, their holding General Assemblies (as they call them, though sometimes they consisted not of above a dozen persons) and maintaining them against the Kings peremptory command to dissolve them, hath several instances. And though this Spirit seems to be mortified, yet the old Genius will certainly return, whenever a new power shall influence and warm them.

Corah, Dathan, and Abiram were as these men hope to be, Men of Renown, Princes over their Congregations; yet this could not bound their ambition; they murmur against Moses and Aaron, as taking too much upon them. And though they were destroyed by the hand of God, to the astonishment of all, yet some of the Faction the next day began to murmur, Numb. 16. 41. (and rebel again.)

Mr. Humphries. Thus I have offered my Mite to the Sanctuary; that is, as much as I have, and what I think fit for cultivation by others whom God shall make wise-hearted and concern'd for the welfare of Sion. Answ. You might have said more truly, That thus you have brought your

176 No **PROTESTANT**, but

your *Coal* to the Sanctuary, and you call aloud for others to bring their *Fire-brands* with them, that they, as the like Confederates of old, may *burn up all the houses of God in the Land*, *Psal. 74. 8.* This is not like a *wise-hearted man* to bring his *Mite* to the Sanctuary, but as one that bath an *evil eye*, to endeavour to reduce the Sanctuary to his *Mite*, and leave it as precarious as are now their *Conventicles*. For when the *Walls* and *Fences* are destroyed, every little *Faction* may set up for himself. *There is room left* (saith Mr. *Humphries*) *for farther Invention, in regard to many the like things as (or greater) than these.* A strange Model this is like to be, that will admit of Alterations and Additions, according to every mans fancy that thinks himself as *wise-hearted* as Mr. *Humphries*: For doubtless, as Mr. *Humphries* and the men of his Persuasion have often altered their own Models, and know not yet where to fix; so others that have as good will to *Sion* as they, are as full of new *Projects*, that will tumble us from one *Precipice* to another, till at last we are swallowed up of that insatiable *Gulph of Rome*. For Mr. *Humphries's* room for farther *Inventions*, doth onely smoothe a way for farther *Inventions* for *Rome*. And I hope they will acquiesce in that *Maxime* of their Dictator, in the *Preface* to the *Nonconformists Plea*: *Liberty in all matters of Faith and Worship*, is the open and apparent way to set up *Papery* in the *Land*. Which being the designe of these *Dis-*
senters

the DISSENTERS Plot. 175

sinters in this *New Counter-Plot*, let the Reader judge whether Dr. *Stillingfleet* and his *Defender*, or Mr. *Lob* and his *Assistants*, are the *Projectors* for *Conjunction* with the Church of Rome.

Psal. 132. 13. *Arise, O Lord, and have mercy upon Sion: for the time to favour her, yea the set-time is come.*

N Post-

Postscript.

HOW implacable, as well as unrelenting, the Malice of these men is against the established Church, their pleading for *Toleration* of *Papists* (which themselves have affirmed to be the ready way to ruin it) and now their proclaiming the *Anabaptists* to be *Sound Protestants* (that they may have the assistance of their hands in this Work of pulling down the Church) are two such Arguments as will not only prove a *Plot*, but such a One as will drown the *noise* and *memory* of the *Powder-plot*, and other *Jesuitical* practices. To which end, I desire the Reader to observe what manner of men these *new Anabaptists*, and these *drivers* for *Independence* are: (which Mr. *Humph.* speaks of in his *Half-sheet*) who are to be *alleged* *Members of the National Church*, when the present Establishment is thrown down. And I

178 No PROTESTANT, but

think Mr. Baxter's description of them, may be a sufficient information; who though now (if we may judge of him by his Associates, to whose designs doubtless he is privy, if not a principal contriver) he esteems them as *Sound Protestants*, was of a contrary Judgment when he wrote his *Book of Infant-baptism* against them. But it is no strange thing for *Ephraim* and *Manasse*, that vexed each other, to joyn amicably against *Judah*; and *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate* to be reconciled against *Christ*.

I suppose then, that Mr. Tombs, and those men of *Beudly* that joyned with him, were in the Judgment of these Dissenters *meer Anabaptists*, such as they now plead for: And this is the Character that Mr. Baxter the Dissenters Leader gave of them in that Book printed 1651. That he describes the *meer Anabaptist* or *Sound Protestant*, is not in his passion, but upon most serious consideration, in judgment and compassion: That the manner and substance of their faith, separated from the malicious intention, is not only a playing of the Devils part, but worse, you, very far worse in several respects, than if it were the Devil that did it. In pleading that Infants are no Church-members, nor Disciples of Christ, and if they belong not to Christs Kingdom, they belong to *Satan*; and herein you vainly exceed the Devil, because it is more natural to the Devil than

the DISSENTERS Plot. 179

to godly men thus to accuse Infants. 2. Because you are neerly related: it is more bainous for a Father to plead his Child out of his inheritance, than for an Enemy. 3. The Devil is moved by his own desperate condition to be malicious, but you cannot say so. 4. The Devil accuseth not but for some fault, &c. Tea, go a step higher, and say it is the Devils part to affirm Infants are Church-members visible, and to maintain their Baptism: I blame my heart that doth no more tremble at and lament such horrid Expressions; as if the Devil were more charitable to Believers infants than they: I wish they do not say next, It is the Devil that brings men to Christ: And p. 177.—P. 134. He proves it to be against the Sixth Commandment, to dip over head in cold water: for that which directly tends to overthrow mens lives, being wilfully used, is plain murder: but dipping, &c. therefore it is murder. He notes, p. 202. That Mr. Tombes was Parson of Ross, Vicar of Lemster, Preacher of Bewdley, Master of the Hospital at Ledbury: and that four Market-Towns lay on his shoulders, p. 203. in all which he might occasion much damage to the Inhabitants. 5. It is a breach of the seventh Commandment, ordinarily to baptize naked: for the Commandment forbids all incitements to uncleanness, and immodest actions. But to baptize women naked, is an incitement to uncleanness, &c. And likely it

180 NO PROTESTANT, but

will raise jealousies in the Ministers Wives and others. p. 136, 137. And p. 138. Their naked baptizing is a known thing, and the wickedness that hath followed on some, and that some have died on it. 6. Mr. Baxter tells us of an Act of Parliament made to prevent the disorders that followed these practices: for poor well-meaning Souls were ignorantly travelling toward their own and the Churches disturbance or desolation through the usual gates of Separation and Anabaptism. Preface at the end. Seldom any came to notorious Heresies, but by this door, p. 143. I have been acquainted with some Anabaptists, who when first infected got their Books, and kept all close to themselves; but then they started out like Sampsons Foxes with Firebrands at their Tails in the Church of Christ, p. 281. for p. 144. They teach as if the holiest men could not be saved till rebaptized, and as if little more than this were required to make men happy. They speak more against Ministers, than the most notorious Scorners, That they are Blood-thirsty Persecutors, Baal's Priests, and Antichristian Seducers. (Mr. Baxter's Language to the Bishops.) Read the Books of Martin Mar-Priest, (who wrote after the Copy of Martin Mar-Prelate) and then judge: as if the first step to Happiness were to scorn their Teachers, whom the Holy Ghost commands them to obey: and it is the most learned of their Teachers that
plead

THE DISSENTERS 181

plead a Necessity of Separation, and that it is
 for to join with us, which all the Baptists unite
 strength among us, p. 145. in Mr. Bowdler's
 at Coventry, p. 147. Of the multitude of Anabaptists
 that I have known, I cannot call to mind
 one that stood there, & they are Separatists, Ar-
 minians, Antinomians, (for they join the
 extremes), Socinians, Libertines, Sockers, Pa-
 milists. See Mr. Denis Knollys, and his Con-
 fession when he was to be put to death for rebelling
 with the Levellers; Collier's Writings against
 Ordinances, Saltmarsh's, and Paul Hobson a So-
 cinian, who taught that God was never at on-
 unity with men, but men with God, and Christ
 did not reconcile God to man, but won to God,
 and did not purchase love, life, and salvation,
 but was sent to manifest them. What shall I
 say of those wicked Ranters against Ordina-
 ces, for the materiality of Souls, and that the Soul
 is God himself, against the truth of Scripture,
 and down-right Familism, Libertinism, and Pa-
 ganism, which all spring from the root of Ana-
 baptism. Mr. Copp and his Followers, called
 the Ranters, or High Atainers, he was a ze-
 alous Anabaptist, he rebaptized more than any
 one in the Country: at last God gave him over,
 and he fell into a Trance, and continued in it
 (as he said) three or four days: and that he
 was in Hell, and had those Revelations which he
 published in his Book, arrogating the Titles of

182 NON-PROTESTANT, but

God; crying down Duties and a godly Life, calling it Plaguy Holiness; swearing most wickedly, and professing that it did him more good to run on men, and tear them by the hair, and curse like a Devil, and make them swear by God, than to joyn in Family-duties, and in Plaguy Holiness, &c. It may be some will say (saith Mr. Baxter) he is mad; but it is otherwise: yet doubtless he is worse than mad in his Delusions. P. 177. Mr. Blackwood would make the world believe that Infant-baptism, and Restraint in matters of Religion, were Antichrist's two last Garisons: which I would have others to think on, that deter thousands of ignorant Professors from the Truth, with the name of Antichrist (NB.) And p. 274. Those of your Country who a while since laid out their Zeal against Infant-baptism, are preaching as zealously against the Godhead of Christ. They are gone so far, that the Parliament is fain to make an Act against them that call themselves God, and say that Whoredom, Murder, &c. is no sin, but he is likest God that committeth them.— P. 269. The Masters of the Levellers designe were Anabaptists of the highest form: what the four men were that lay in the Tower, is no secret, and what their Leaders in the Field. Their slain General Tompson was one of our Corporals, and all the professing part of the Souldiery of my Acquaintance, were of the same way: and Mr. Den was Cornet. Yet was the

the DISSENTERS Plot. 183

the business of Munster inferiour to their designe; they were in a fair way to have drawn most of the Army to their Party, and so to have overthrown Parliament, General, Commonwealth, Religion, and all that was worth the having. P. 197.

Mr. Baxter notes how far the hand of God was revealed against such persons, in the two instances of Monstrous Births brought forth in New England, by Mrs. Dyer and Mrs. Hutchinson, the two Leading Sectaries and Disturbers of the Churches in New England; the one having a variety of Births, and the other a Monster with variety of parts, suitable to the variety of their monstrous Opinions; as the parts of Birds, Fishes, Beasts, (as horns) of men. This was the extraordinary directing Finger of God; and he thus blames Mr. Tombes for not observing this Judgment: It seems if he had seen the Wonders of Egypt, he would not onely have been hardened, as Pharaoh, but judged that God laid them as Stumbling-blocks.

And now who can think that it could ever enter into the heart of Mr. Baxter or his Disciples, to plead for such a Sect to be made Members of our National Church? but, as Mr. Baxter says, The heart is a deceitful thing; and many a man with Hazael have at first abhorred the mention of those Impieties which in time they espoused and defended; and that without any fear of being Fire-brands in Hell, for being such in the Church of God.

One

184 No PROTESTANT, but

One wonderful Effect more (but not so bad) Mr. Baxter observes of these Anabaptistical courses, p. 145. (viz.) *That the Episcopal Party are more confirmed in their way by it, and say, Now you see what it is to cut up the Hedge, and pluck up the Banks of Government; there was none of this work under the government of the Bishops; you see how you have mended the matter, by extirpation of them Root and Branch. Yea, those that were offended at the Prelates cruelty in silencing and suspending, do now think they did well; and it was needful, for the quenching this Fire while it was in the spark. And many that began to stagger at the King's late Cause and Wars, are now many thousands of them perswaded of the lawfulness of it, meerly from the Miscarriages of these men. Yea, thousands and millions of Papists are hardened in their Religion by the Miscarriages of these men, and say, These are your Reformers, and this is your Reformation!*

And I intreat those who now plead for such as Sound Protestants, to consider that Sacred Scripture which Mr. Baxter there adds: *It must needs be that offences will come; but wo to those men by whom they come: It were better for them that a mill-stone were hanged about their necks, and they cast into the depth of the sea.* How is it that those Dissenters are not both ashamed and afraid to call these Sound

Pro-

Protestants, and in the same breath call the Sons of the Church of England, Contrivers for Rome, and Papists in Masquerade; when as Bishop Sanderfon demonstrates, S. 23. of his Preface, this is the certain way to bring in Popery? Yet all this notwithstanding, Mr. Baxter for his part thinks that matters were not half so out of order in those times, as some men supposed them, in his Epistle to Richard Cromwel: And cries out in his Sermon before the Kings Return, O what happy times we once saw (i. e. in the times of Rebellion) nor can I be so unthankful for all the sins and miscarriages of men, as to say that we have not received much mercy from the Lord. And concludes,

Hitherto the Lord hath helped us.

But Mr. Baxter tells the Separate Congregations, in an Epistle to them—The hand of God is gone out against the Separatists: you see you do but prepare persons for a farther progress: Seekers, Ranters, Quakers, and too many professed Infidels, do spring up from among you. Parties will arise in the Separated Churches, and separate themselves from them, till they are dissolved. As wise men as Mr. Baxter long since observed the same.

Archbishop Whigf and Mr. Hooker, did foretel, That if ever (Presbytery, which then was called) Puritanism, should prevail in our Nation, it would soon draw Anabaptism after

186 No PROTESTANT, but

it. See Bishop *Sanderson's* Preface, Sect. 23. It being natural for *one Sect* to propagate *another*, and for every Generation to degenerate and grow worse. And yet after all this, Mr. *Baxter* seems more inclinable to *Anabaptistry* than *Conformity*: for in his Epistle to the *first Plea*, he says, That Mr. *Tombes* had wrote more for it, than any that had written for *Conformity*: of which he names a great many. And if we may guess by what Mr. *Baxter* hath done, at what he is ready still to do, we may conclude, that he is still prepared to joyn with them. His old Fellow-souldiers were Cornet *Den* and Corporal *Tompson*, with whom he fought: And p. 247. of *Infant-baptism*, he tells Mr. *Tombes*, *I have left all I had for the Publick Cause, and served them mostly on my own charge, from the first day of the War to the last; and hazarded my Life over and over, and almost lost it: for I do but live.* That Good Old Cause it seems was dearer to him than his life: for p. 167. he observes, that in *Ecclus. 4. 28.* *Strive for the truth unto death, and the Lord shall fight for thee: and I found that he did,* saith the religious and peaceable Mr. *Baxter*, whom we now leave with those other Sound Protestants, Mr. *Lob* and Mr. *Humphries* and the *Anabaptists*, with this Memento: *Believe not them to be Friends of the Church, that would cure and reform her by cutting her Throat.* Epist. Dedicat. to *Saints Rest.*

the DISSENTERS Flot. 187

It was that old Sorceress *Medea* that prevailed with the Daughters of *Beleus* to cut their Fathers Throat, and chop his Limbs in pieces, that he might by her Inchantments grow young again: And those Empericks that apply the like violent means to reform their Mother the Church, how religiously soever they pretend to do it, do serve that great Impostor, who by no other means or method can hope to effect that Revenge and Ruine which he designs against her.

After such Satyrical Investives against the *Anabaptists*, the Reader might think it as impossible for the two Poles to meet, as to find any Reconciliation between Mr. *Baxter* and them: yet when I perceived that Mr. *Loe* and other his Disciples were so favourable to them as to plead for their admission as Members of the National Church, I suspected that their Oracle (as those of old) had delivered to them a doubtful or double sense, which they might with his authority accomodate to their great designe. And I called to mind Mr. *Baxter's* resolution of this Quere, p. 123. of his *Christian Directory*, part 3.

May *Anabaptists* that have no other Error, be admitted to Church-Communion?

Ans. Yes, and tolerated in their own practice also: for 1. They agree with us in all points

1881 NON-RESISTANT

paines absolutely necessary to Communion. 2. The ancient Christians had liberty either to baptize, or to let them stay till Age, as they thought best, and therefore Tertullian and Nazianzen speak against haste. And Augustine, and many Children of Christian Parents, were baptized at age. 3. The Controversie is of so great difficulty, that if in all such cases none that differ be tolerated, we may not live together in the World or the Church: but endlessly excommunicate or persecute one another. 4. Such false Anabaptists will consent to profess openly that they do devote their Children to God, according to all the power or duty which they can find communicated or layd upon them in the Word of God. Then Mr. Baxter's P. R. O. O. F. O. F. I. N. F. A. N. T. B. A. P. T. I. S. M. was not P. I. N. A. I. N. S. C. R. I. B. I. T. U. R. E. S. B. O. O. F. I. Q. U. I. T. A. T. I. F. O. A. L. L. H. E. L. I. E. V. E. D. T. H. A. T. G. O. D. W. O. U. L. D. G. R. A. S. P. I. T. H. E. M. I. N. T. H. I. S. G. A. T. H. E. R. A. S. T. H. E. I. R. D. E. D. I. C. A. T. I. O. N. T. H. E. Y. W. O. U. L. D. W. I. L. L. I. N. G. L. Y. D. O. I. T. (A. N. D. T. H. A. T. A. C. T. U. A. L. L. Y. T. H. E. Y. D. O. A. S. S. I. G. N. T. H. E. M. T. O. G. O. D. A. C. C. O. R. D. I. N. G. T. O. T. H. E. I. R. P. O. W. E. R. A. N. D. P. R. O. M. I. S. E. T. O. B. R. I. N. G. T. H. E. M. U. P. I. N. H. I. S. W. A. Y. A. N. D. W. H. O. C. A. N. F. O. R. C. E. M. A. N. S. W. I. L. L. C. H. O. S. E. A. R. I. G. H. T. F. O. R. T. H. E. M. S. E. L. V. E. S. O. R. A. N. Y. O. T. H. E. R. S. ?

The Satyrist (we find) can blow cold as well as hot. And whether he hath better performed the Office of an Adverser or an Advocate for that part of the Brotherhood is disputable; but evident enough, that he hath

the DISSENTERS Plot. 169

now said as much for them, as any or all of that Sect ever pleaded for themselves, in so few lines. What is the cause of this great Change? The *Anabaptists* are still the same, in their principles and practices, as formerly; as industrious to defend their Errors, and propagate their Numbers, as ever; and perhaps Mr. Baxter hates them in his heart as much now, when he labours to wash them white, as when he represented them as so many Black-moors. But *Tempora mutantur* &c. &c. &c. Mr. Baxter's Pen is guided by the hand of Time. When he wrote his Satyr, there was no need of such mad Fellows; the Church of England was sufficiently depressed, beyond any probability of a Resurrection; the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* were a slight sufficient to keep it under water. But now there is need of a *Brotherly* assistance to immerse it again; and these (or formerly) *Antinomians*, *Persecutors*, and *Intolerable Anabaptists* are invited, by the name of *Blind Presbyterians* and *Seduced Anabaptists* to take part in this great and necessary Work. So soon as they are got into considerable Offices in the great City, and have given themselves a *Dispensation* to *swear* and *swear* what they formerly declared unlawful, because it may capacitate them to do the more mischief. They may serve their Masters as *Justices*, or *Stewards*, or *Common Council*

190 No PROTESTANT, but

cil-men at least. And the advance of the Good Old Cause hath ever been thought sufficient to sanctifie any Agents that shall be instrumental therein: *Tros-tyriusve-nullo discrimine habetur*. Be he Anabaptist, Quaker, or Fifth-Monarchy-man, though he be no Master-builder, if he be able to pull down the old Fabrick of the Church, there are some will see *ther hands on work*, and thank them too.

Our Dissenters are equally reconcilable to any Sect, how pernicious soever, as they are irreconcilable to the established Church: *Delenda est Carthago*, though Rome onely do triumph in her ruine. *Simeon* of old time could not have effected his designe, if *Levi* had not conspired with him. When they that should be the great Instruments of Peace, prove Incendiaries to War, and make Religion and the Cause of God the pretence. How easily were the People led to those acts of Cruelty which good old Jacob abhorred, and proclaimed a Curse against the Agents, though his own Children! Gen. 49. 6, 7. O my Soul, come not thou into their secret, unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united. — Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce, and their wrath, for it was cruel. I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel. The Pulpit hath usually been abused to beat an Alarm before the Drum. The War was begun in our Streets (saith Mr. Baxter)

before

the DISSENTERS Plot. 121

before King or Parliament had lifted any *Sentences*. The Conventicles are taught how to *take the Field*; and carry with them an *Armatus Evangelium*. I wish England do not once more dance after the *Scotch Pipe*.

When those *Divines* that were bred up with the *Small Catechism* begin to draw up into *Clubs*; when the same persons that encouraged thousands to engage in the former War, are as active to incite the Nation to a new one; and they who magnified the Conduct of the *Cromwell*, do as much vilify the present Government, when the People are managed by the same hands, in the same steps, and under the same pretences, as they were in our former Troubles, we may justly fear they are already engaged in the *Counter-plot* against those who are maliciously insinuated to intend a *Conjuration* with the Church of Rome, i.e. the Church of England. And the flame being once kindled in the Church, it will easily reach the Court, as Mr. Baxter observes.

A great and loyal part of this Nation have declared their just abhorrence of a late Designe for an Association, as it hath been printed in *Secretal Papers*. For my part, I think that the *Snare* is laid in vain in the sight of those that have been once already on the brink of Destruction by such impious Artifices. Yet

this

192 No PROTESTANT, but

this I suppose may be easily evinced, that how mischievous soever that Association be, that which our Dissenters call a Union is pregnant with such a Monster, and may run parallel with it, if not out-run it: the pretences are alike specious in both.

Doth the Association pretend The defence of the true Protestant Religion, against Popery, and all Popish Superstition, Idolatry, and Innovations, and all those who shall endeavour to spread or advance it within this Kingdom? So doth this Union, in opposition to the Project of others for Conjunction with the Church of Rome. Our Bishops are termed by their Chieftains, Popish Clergie-men. The whole Church is accused, as having made many Steps towards Rome. Our Government and Ceremonies are represented as such Antichristian Abominations, that the removal of them was accounted sufficient to countervail for the Blood and Treasure spent and spilt in the late War.

Doth the Association pretend the lawful Rights and Liberties of the Subject, against Entroachments and Arbitrary power? The Union far exceeds this, making loud Outcries of Actual Persecution, Goals, and Imprisonment, seizing their Goods and Estates, starving them, their Wives, and Children; and all this by the Tearing Engines of the Law,

the DISSENTERS Plot. 193

as Mr. Baxter calls them: and for no other cause, but preaching the Gospel, and saving Souls. Whereas the Laws onely forbid the practising of *Sedition* in the State, and prepagating *Anabaptism* and other *Schisms* in the Church: which if it be a means of saving Souls, it must be by preaching some other Gospel than what hath hitherto been received in the Church. And whether it favours more of *Arbitrary Power*, to restrain the liberty of doing mischief, by the execution of wholesome Laws, or to live in open Transgression and defiance of those Laws; let those judge that know the practice of the *Unitors*.

Do the *Associators* offer a Latitude, professing that they are most ready to accept and admit any others into their Society? The *Union* had done this before, declaring, That the *Dissenters in general* (not *Anabaptists* onely) are already united, and their hands ready for the Work; to which end they are in quest of a *Master-workman*; and send out their *Celeusmas*, encouraging all hands to this Momentous Work; promising even to such *Country Conformists* as shall come in to their *Union*, More favour than ever they found from their *Superiours*.

The *Associators* say they will follow such Orders as they shall receive from the present

194 NO PROTESTANT, &c.

Parliament, or the major part of both Houses; when it shall be prorogued or dissolved. Our Dissenters instead of obeying Orders, resolve to impose them on the Parliament, and have formed their Designs into a Bill, which none but a Reprobate Parliament dares reject.

Do the Associators bind themselves in a Bond of a firm Association, promising and vowing before God to oppose and pursue to destruction, all such as upon any Title whatsoever (the King not excepted) shall oppose their just and righteous ends; and that they will not for any respect of persons or causes, or for fear or reward, separate themselves from that Association, or fail in the prosecution thereof during their lives, upon pain of being by the rest prosecuted and suppressed as perjured persons, and publick enemies to God, the King, and their Native Country? All this the Unitors think themselves obliged by the Solemn League and Covenant, which they contend to be such a Vow to God, as is indispensable by man: and what their sense of defending the Kings person in the defence of the true Protestant Religion, is, as their subsequent actions did declare in former times, so their present practices, condemning all that oppose their ends as lyars, and deliberate perjured persons, Wolves and mad Dogs, fit onely

THE DISSENTERIAN DQ5

to be destroyed; their persisting in these Enormities, without any relentment of the favours that have been shewed them, or the dread of the punishments to which they have made themselves obnoxious, are plain demonstrations.

Do the *Associators* carry on their Designe secretly, by *obscure Agents*, *private Cabals*, and *Country-Committees*; having so much shamefacedness or subtilty, as not to own or actually subscribe their Association? The *Unitors* publish their Designe in *print*, with *hands subscribed*, on behalf of themselves and their Brethren; affronting his Majesties Council with it, and not forbearing to spit it in the face of Majesty it self: An act more impudent and offensive, than that of the *bloudy Souldiers* to his *Royal Father*!

This certainly is *No true Protestant Plot*: But whether it be not the sense of the *Dissenters Counter-plot*, I leave to the judgment of all disengaged persons.

Having finished this Tract on the Feast of *St. Matthias*, I think it very seasonable to conclude with the Collect for that day.

O Almighty God, who in the place of the
 Traitor Judas didst chuse thy faithful
 Seruant Matthias to be of the number of
 the twelve Apostles, Grant that thy Church
 being alway preserved from false Apostles,
 may be ordered and governed by faithful
 and true Pastors, through Iesus Christ
 our Lord. Amen.

FINIS.

